### Capitalism K

### Link-Bilateral Trade

**Modeling of neoliberal economic policies by the US towards any other state advances neoliberalism everywhere, especially in the target state**

**Gathii ’11** (James Thuo, Wing-Tat Lee Chair in Internation Law and Professor of Law at Loyola University Chicago School of Law, “The Neoliberal Turn in Regional Trade Agreements,” Washington Law Review 86.3, October 2011, ProQuest, 07/06/13, ..http://search.proquest.com/docview/909616504/13F1625DC522878C31F/2?accountid=7113 SM)

Further, **bilateralism and regionalism in trade are fads that are spreading neoliberal economic ideals to the periphery of the global trading system**. In other words, emulation by small developing countries of neoliberal economic ideas and policies is a significant driver of economic reform. **Developing countries adopt neoliberalism not simply because it is imposed, as many previous accounts suggest. Rather, neoliberalism is voluntarily adopted** for a variety of reasons. First, there has been a convergence in the thinking of policymakers and academics in developing and developed countries through education or professional associations and contacts. Thus, **developing countries are not isolated jurisdictions shaping their trade policies independently of other jurisdictions in developed economies**. On this account, developing countries - particularly their form of the modern state - were historically created by similar projections of metropolitan power or mimicry of postcolonial elites. Thus, **it is difficult to sustain hard and fast boundaries between locally produced ideas in a distinct autonomous zone and centrally produced ideas generated under the aegis of neoliberalism that developing countries must be protected and insulated from.** Here, the literature on the autonomy of local government from centralized or federal decision making is very instructive. As the scholars in this area have noted, **efforts to promote local autonomy from central power are "better understood as efforts to alter the central frameworks within which local discretion is inevitably exercised, rather than as attempts to substitute centralized command for local control."**268¶ Second, **government officials in developing countries have adopted neoliberal reforms because they believe that such reforms are preconditions to achieving increased economic growth and efficiency in the public sector**. Third, **officials in developing countries are strategically adopting neoliberal reforms through bilateral and regional trade agreements because such reforms signal that a country is "safe" for investment**. Moreover, these agreements provide budget support that is otherwise unavailable to these developing country officials in their home country. Fourth, **officials in developing countries are often passive imitators. In the absence of solid evidence as to the efficacy of neoliberal ideals and often without having undertaken research into alternative reform ideas**, these officials rationally resort to neoliberal ideals.269¶ In short, this Article has argued that **the increased number of regional and bilateral trade agreements represents an important opportunity for further diffusion of neoliberal economic ideals**, an insight often missing in leading accounts that have emphasized how this trend conforms to or departs from the norms of the WTO. Ultimately, constructivism can better account for the circumstances under which neoliberalism arises by taking into consideration the context within which these ideas are generated and perpetuated, **resulting in** **a policy framework in which choices favoring neoliberalism are more likely to be exercised by developing countries.**

### Link-Corporations

#### Even non-government affiliated international businesses’ spread US capitalist strategies by dominating business culture and crowding out other economic systems

Elteren 03, (Mel van Elteren, professor of social sciences at Tilburg University, “U.S. Cultural Imperialism: Today Only a Chimera”, Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press DOI, 7/5/13 SS, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais\_review/v023/23.2elteren.html)

U.S. culture has particularly influenced, and continues to dominate, corporate culture. Over the past two or three decades, transnational corporations based in the United States, Europe, and Japan have created strategic alliances over a wide range of industries that transcend national boundaries. Yet, many of these corporations retain distinctive “American” overtones in terms of business culture and production because, in most fields, U.S. companies have the “first mover” advantage, allowing them to set standards for management practices and production techniques. U.S.-based corporations also have a powerful competitive advantage over firms firmly embedded in the social market economies of Europe and Asia. The social costs that European and Asian firms carry enable them to function without undermining the social cohesion of the societies in which they operate but also make them less competitive with U.S. firms that do not have the same responsibilities. The kind of corporate capitalism aimed at the short-term interests of CEOs and shareholders that U.S. companies epitomize tends to crowd out social market capitalism and other forms of associative, stakeholder capitalism.¶ Anglo-American managerial ideologies and practices also dominate most business education. Business education began in the kind of corporate capitalism aimed at the short-term interests of CEOs and shareholders that U.S. companies epitomize tends to crowd out social market capitalism and other forms of associative, stakeholder capitalism.¶ the United States and has enjoyed enormous and increasing popularity over the last two decades. Leading U.S. business schools have formed strategic alliances with counterparts elsewhere in the world, founding international business schools biased toward U.S. business models, which then shape the practices of executives around the world.26 U.S. management consulting firms have also been vehicles for spreading U.S. managerial styles to other countries. In the mid-1980s, some 700 of these firms were active in about one hundred countries, and their number has increased rapidly since then.27 On the academic side, U.S. neoliberal think tanks, experts, and mentors (notably those of the economics and political science departments of the University of Chicago, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harvard University) have been very influential in shaping governments’ business and market policies abroad, for example, in various Latin American countries. The diffusion of the American way of management has also occurred through the frequent speaking tours of American management gurus abroad; a widespread focus on U.S. companies and management practices in the business media (which goes back to the dominance of U.S. media); and the large number of popular books on management originating in the United States.

### Link-Cuba

#### Anti-capitalist ideals can only flourish if isolated, US engagement would only promote capitalism

Font 09,

(Mauricio A. Font, Ph.D. at the University of Michigan Sociology, 2009, “A Changing Cuba in a Changing World”, Bildner Publication, <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/bildnercenter/publications/documents/ChangingCuba-ChangingWorld.pdf#page=35>)

Prominent social scientist and historian Rafael Hernández, known for¶ his firm defense of the regime in domestic and international forums, is¶ nevertheless brutally candid in admitting that “The hothouse in which the¶ system and the culture of socialism could flourish, was shattered more¶ than ten years ago.”17 The negative impact of the growth of tourism, the¶ growing gap in social equality, the presence of fashion and behavior foreign to socialism in everyday life is already sufficient, he says, to consider¶ that challenges associated with a reencounter with capitalism do not¶ belong to a faraway and improbable future. Even so, Hernández believes¶ the “new” Cuba will retain the major gains of the revolution but not without serious challenges. Hernandez argues that the fundamental question is¶ not even if Cuba can resist the cultural onslaught of capitalism, but rather¶ “what a system (or the project of a system) is worth that cannot endure the¶ merciless blast from the elements outside of its hothouse and flourish on¶ its own?” The system, the culture and the values of a possible socialism,¶ he argues, cannot be protected by “an ideological condom,” only through acquired immunities that permit it to survive even in the face of the virus¶ coming from contact with the outside. “This vaccination, this acquired¶ immunity,” he concludes, “has been taking place for 12 years now, not¶ without cost, but still without showing signs of fatal illness.”

### Link - Democracy

#### The 1AC’s Promotion of democracy is a lie, this is merely a banner for which they can undermine true democracy to entrench the capitalist order

Robinson 05,

(William Robinson, PhD and professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, 2005, “The United States, Venezuela, and 'democracy promotion': William I Robinson interviewed”, Open Democracy, 7/5/13 SS, http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-protest/venezuala\_2730.jsp)

The promotion of democracy is inherently not imperialist; on the contrary, it is inherently revolutionary, progressive and wonderful! But the people who are promoting democracy are social movements in the global north and global south, solidarity movements in the north, mass movements in the south. What the United States is promoting, in Venezuela or elsewhere, is not democracy. United States foreign policy has absolutely nothing to do with promoting democracy; what it is doing is inherently imperialist.¶ But my argument in no way suggests that democratization movements around the world are creatures of foreign policy; rather, it says that changes in US foreign policy and new modalities in US intervention are meant specifically to challenge, undermine, limit, and control the extent of social and political change in countries where masses of people – including the elite – are struggling for democracy.¶ In this perspective, US political intervention under the banner of “democracy promotion” is aimed at undermining authentic democracy, gaining control over popular movements for democratization, keeping a lid on popular democracy movements, and limiting any change that may be brought about by mass democratization movements so that the outcomes of democracy struggles do not threaten the elite order and integration into global capitalism.¶ If democracy means the power of the people, mass participation in the vital decisions of society, and democratic distribution of material and cultural resources, then democracy is a profound threat to global capitalist interests and must be mercilessly opposed and suppressed by US and transnational elites.¶ What is new about the strategy of “democracy promotion” is that this opposition and suppression is now conducted under the rhetorical banner of promoting democracy and through sophisticated new instruments and modalities of political intervention.

### Link – Hegemony

#### The modern Globalization is a reaffirmation of labor control techniques, Specifically the American hegemon is a construction of racial division and domination

Quijano 2k, (Anibal Quijano, PhD and professor in sociology, “Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America”, 7/5/13 SS, <http://www.unc.edu/~aescobar/wan/wanquijano.pdf>)

What is termed globalization is the culmination of a process that began with the constitution of America and colonial/modern Eurocentered capitalism as a new global power. One of the¶ fundamental axes of this model of power is the social classiﬁcation of the¶ world’s population around the idea of race, a mental construction that expresses the basic experience of colonial domination and pervades the more¶ important dimensions of global power, including its speciﬁc rationality:¶ Eurocentrism. The racial axis has a colonial origin and character, but it¶ has proven to be more durable and stable than the colonialism in whose¶ matrix it was established. Therefore, the model of power that is globally¶ hegemonic today presupposes an element of coloniality. In what follows,¶ my primary aim is to open up some of the theoretically necessary questions¶ about the implications of coloniality of power regarding the history of Latin¶ America. America was constituted as the ﬁrst space/time of a new model of power¶ of global vocation, and both in this way and by it became the ﬁrst identity of modernity. Two historical processes associated in the production of¶ that space/time converged and established the two fundamental axes of the¶ new model of power. One was the codiﬁcation of the differences between¶ conquerors and conquered in the idea of “race,” a supposedly different biological structure that placed some in a natural situation of inferiority to¶ the others. The conquistadors assumed this idea as the constitutive, founding element of the relations of domination that the conquest imposed. On this basis, the population of America, and later the world, was classiﬁed¶ within the new model of power. The other process was the constitution of a¶ new structure of control of labor and its resources and products. This new¶ structure was an articulation of all historically known previous structures¶ of control of labor, slavery, serfdom, small independent commodity production and reciprocity, together around and upon the basis of capital and¶ the world market.

### Link-IMF

#### The IMF has only strangled Latin America and trapped them, it is another tool in the United States arsenal for conquering the world in the name of capitalism

Galeano 71, (Eduardo Galeano, journalist, writer and novelist, International Human Rights Award by Global Exchange, 1971, “The Open Vein of Latin America”, 7/5/13 SS, http://www.e-reading-lib.com/bookreader.php/149187/Open\_Veins\_of\_Latin\_America.pdf)

In all Latin America, the system produces much less than the necessary monetary demand, and inflation results from this structural impotence. Yet the IMF, instead of attacking the causes of the production apparatus’s insufficient supply, launches its cavalry against the consequences, crushing even further the feeble consumer power of the internal market: in these lands of hungry multitudes, the IMF lays the blame for inflation at the door of excessive demand. Its stabilization and development formulas have not only failed to stabilize or develop; they have tightened the external stranglehold on these countries, deepened the poverty of the dispossessed masses--bringing social tensions to the boiling point--and hastened economic and financial denationalization in the name of the sacred principles of free trade, free competition, and freedom of movement for capital. The United States, which itself operates an enormous protectionist system--tariffs, quotas, internal subsidies--has never earned a glance from the IMF. Toward Latin America, on the other hand, the IMF is inflexible: for this it was brought into the world. As soon as Chile accepted the first IMF mission in 1954, the country swarmed with its "advisors"; and today most of the governments blindly follow its directives. The therapy makes the sick man sicker, the better to dose him with the drug of loans and investments. The IMF extends loans or flashes the indispensable green light for others to extend them. Born in the United States, headquartered in the United States, and at the service of the United States, the Fund effectively operates as an international inspector without whose approval U.S. banks will not loosen their purse strings. The World Bank, the Agency for International Development, and other philanthropic organizations of global scope likewise make their credits conditional on the signature and implementation of the receiving governments’ “letters of intention” to the all- powerful Fund. All the Latin American countries put together do not have half as many votes as the United States in the direction of the policy of this supreme genie of world monetary equilibrium. The IMF was created to institutionalize Wall Street's financial dominion¶ over the whole planet, when the dollar first achieved hegemony as international currency after World War II. It has never been untrue to its master.

### Link- Instant Gratification

#### Modern capitalism has pushed us into the society of the spectacle, where capitalism continues its existence through giving us small, pseudo-gratifications for the desires it creates. This ensures global catastrophe..

**Eagles 2012**

(Julian Eagles, Phd from London School of Economics, “Guy Debord and the Integrated Spectacle”, http://www.fastcapitalism.com , Fast Capitalism, 9/1/13, accessed 7/5/13, JK)

Now, I think the way in which the Situationists imagine that the spectacle reproduces itself, remains, on a general level, the same throughout their oeuvre -early or late.[[13]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn13) That said, the particular manner in which the spectacle modifies the individual’s passions is portrayed, in Debord’s later oeuvre, as a more intensive process of repression than the Situationists previously imagined. Arguably, this stronger repression refers to the following (although I must stress that this is not made explicit in Debord’s later writings): that as the capitalist system, by the 1980s, produced a greater range of commodified goods and reified roles for people to consume, there emerged, for the mass of the population, niche markets for commodities. ¶ Spectacular society, through offering a huge range of ‘image-objects’[[14]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn14) (alienated goods and roles) for consumption,[[15]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn15) manipulates the individual’s sexual instinct. It stimulates – via images – the individual’s real desires, but only permits ‘pseudo-gratification’.[[16]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn16) The individual, whose passions are subjected to a type of repression as they are ‘rechannelled…in roles’ (Vaneigem 1994: 133) or through the consumption of goods, experiences controlled pleasure; the spectacle, therefore, frustrates the realization of the individual’s real desires.[[17]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn17) Post 1968, modern capitalism, due to changes in mass production techniques, offers a greater variety of image-objects from which to choose than hitherto. And it is through the niche marketing of commodities, it seems, that the spectacle has become more sophisticated in its manipulation of the individual’s real desires. Yet this requires – although this is potentially problematic for the spectacle – that the individual becomes more aware of the specificity of his or her desires (see section III). That said, the spectacle continues, nevertheless, to thwart genuine self-realization, as it re-routes the individual’s authentic desires towards commodified forms of leisure or play.[[18]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn18)¶ In addition to modern capitalism’s manipulation of the individual’s sexual instinct, I think it can also be argued that the integrated spectacle manipulates, as did the spectacle (in a minor way) in its diffuse form and (to a greater extent) in its concentrated version, the instinct of self-preservation to help perpetuate itself (see below).[[19]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn19) With this in mind, let us explore in greater detail how the spectacle in its integrated form functions.¶ In his Comments on the Society of the Spectacle, Debord brings the notion of fear more to the fore.[[20]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn20) He claims that:¶ Going from success to success, until 1968 modern society was convinced it was loved. It has since had to abandon these dreams; it prefers to be feared (Debord 1990: 82).¶ What Debord implies here, I think, is that the 1968 rebellion in France revealed –particularly to the ruling class – that the majority of the population was not deeply integrated into spectacular society. In addition to this, Debord suggests that the spectacle ‘has at least sufficient lucidity to expect that its free and unhindered reign will very shortly lead to a significant number of major catastrophes’ (1990: 62). He points to an ecological catastrophe, citing the dangers associated with nuclear power plants and the destruction of the earth’s ozone layer by CFC gases (1990: 34-8, 62). He also mentions an economic catastrophe, ‘in banking, for example’ (1990: 62). For Debord, then, the circumstances of the post 1968 era have been conducive for fear to become a major factor in relation to the reproduction of spectacular society.[[21]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn21)¶ Surveillance organizations, which lurk in the background ready to strike at organized opposition, make people fear the consequences of dissent. They ensure that proletarian[[22]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn22) opposition to spectacular society is ‘eliminated’ (Debord 1990: 80) or ‘dispersed’ (1990: 84). Debord maintains that: Under spectacular domination people conspire to maintain it, and to guarantee what it alone would call its well-being. This conspiracy *is a part* of its very functioning (1990: 74).

### Link—Protectionist Policies

**Protectionist policies strengthen American competitiveness and control**

Petras 10, (Prof. James Petras, Professor of Sociology at Binghamton University, 12/2/10, “Latin America’s Twenty First Century Capitalism and the US Empire”, 7/5/13 SS, http://www.globalresearch.ca/latin-america-s-twenty-first-century-capitalism-and-the-us-empire/22223)

By the middle of 2010 it was clear that the US economy was losing the competitive battle for markets around the world and was unable to reduce its trade and fiscal deficit within the existing global free trade regime. The Obama regime, led by Federal Reserve head Bernacke and Treasury Secretary Geithner unilaterally launched a thinly disguised trade war, effectively devaluating the dollar and lowering interest rates on bonds in order to increase exports and in effect ‘overvalue’ the currency of their competitors. In other words the Obama regime resorted to a virile “bugger your neighbor policies”, which outraged world economic leaders, provoking Brazilian economic leaders to speak of a “currency war”. Contrary to Washington’s rhetoric of “greater co-operation”, the Obama regime was resorting to protectionist policies designed to alienate the leading economic powers in the region.¶ No longer in a position to impose non-reciprocal trade agreements to US advantage, Washington is engaged in currency manipulation in order to increase market shares at the expense of the highly competitive emerging economies of Latin America and Asia, as well as Germany.¶ Equally prejudicial to Latin America, the Federal Reserve’s lowering of interest rates leads to heavy borrowing in the US in order to speculate in high interest countries like Brazil. The consequences are disastrous, as a flood of “hot money”, speculative funds flow into Latin America, especially Brazil, overvaluating the currency and provoking a speculative bubble in bonds and real estate, while encouraging excess liquidity and public and private consumer debt. Equally damaging the overvalued currencies price industrial and manufacturing out of world market competition, threatening to “de-industrialize” the economies and further their dependency on agro-mineral exports. US resort to unilateral protectionism tells us that the decline in US economic power has reached a point where it struggles to compete with Latin America rather than to reassert its former dominant position. Protectionism is a defense mechanism of an empire in decline. While Washington can pretend otherwise, the weapons it chooses to arrest its loss of competitiveness in the short run, sets in motion a process of growing Latin America integration and increased trade with Asian economies, which will deepen Latin America’s economic independence from US control.

### Link – Telecommunication

#### Avocations for telecommunication is a Trojan horse for the assimilation of culture and the broader purpose of capitalist promotion

Elteren 03, (Mel van Elteren, professor of social sciences at Tilburg University, “U.S. Cultural Imperialism: Today Only a Chimera”, Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press DOI, 7/5/13 SS, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais\_review/v023/23.2elteren.html)

The process of U.S. transculturation, however, has not rested entirely on these advantages. The U.S. government has played an important role in promoting cultural exports, not only as a source of export income but also as a means of exporting beliefs, values, and practices that inherently favor U.S.-based corporate capitalism. U.S. officials emphasize the need for a free flow of information and entertainment across the world. But the reality of the “free market” entails regulation in various domains as well as state support. The U.S. government backs its film and television industries whenever foreign governments try to restrain the flow of U.S. audiovisual products abroad. It has contributed enormously to the development of communications infrastructures, such as satellites, while monitoring and threatening nations or specific institutions or groups that do not uphold media firms’ copyrights. The United States also uses diplomatic means to reduce or remove barriers to its media exports. During international negotiations over a Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) that began in 1995, the United States spearheaded the fight for an agreement encompassing all media, communications, and cultural activities. As proposed, it would have seriously eroded the already limited autonomy of local and state authorities to regulate foreign investments and the operations of transnational corporations in the realms of economic, environmental, and social affairs. The MAI was ultimately defeated in December 1998 by a global resistance movement that included a coalition of national and local politicians and a wide variety of transnational and local groups, but such attempts at deregulation may be successful in the future.

### Link –USFG

#### The decline in Latin America is happening now, with it, independence is flourishing. The 1AC’s use of the USFG acting into Latin America will only hinder this progress

Petras 10, (Prof. James Petras, Professor of Sociology at Binghamton University, 12/2/10, “Latin America’s Twenty First Century Capitalism and the US Empire”, 7/5/13 SS, http://www.globalresearch.ca/latin-america-s-twenty-first-century-capitalism-and-the-us-empire/22223)

Lumpen capitalism develops a dynamic of its own, independent of its role as an imperial instrument for destroying popular insurgency. It challenges imperial collaborator regimes. It displaces, threatens, or cajoles foreign and domestic capitalists. In the extreme, it establishes a private army, seizes territorial control, recruits and trains networks of intelligence agents within the armed forces and police, undermining imperial influence. In a word lumpen organized military capitalism threatens the security of imperial hegemony: newly emerging predators threaten the established collaborators. The imperial attempts to use and dispose of lumpen counterinsurgency forces has failed; the demobilized paras become the professional gunmen of a “third force” – neither imperial nor insurgent. The decimation of the reformist center-left option, which took hold in Latin America, precludes a socio-economic alternative capable of integrating the young combative unemployed, stimulating the productive economy, diversifying markets and escaping the pitfalls of a US centered neo-liberal order. The divergence of priorities and strategies between Latin America’s center-left and Washington has as much to do with economic and class interests as it has with ideological agendas. For the US security means defeating the rising power of lumpen military economic formations in their remaining ‘power bases’. For Latin America, security concerns are secondary to diversifying and boosting market shares within Latin America and overseas. Lumpen power is currently under the political control of domestic rulers in Latin America; it is out of control in US clients. The US solution is military; the Latin approach is greater growth; social expenditures and police repression especially in Brazil. The Latin solution has greater attraction, evident in Colombia’s break with the US military base and encirclement strategy toward Venezuela. Colombia’s new President opted for $8 billion dollar trade deals with Venezuela’s Chavez over and against costly million dollar military base agreements with the US.¶ Clearly the US economic decline in Latin America as a direct result of its reliance on military and lumpen power, is in full force. The driving force of accelerated decline is not popular insurgency but the attraction and lucrative opportunities of the economic marketplace within Latin America and beyond for the local ruling classes. Insofar as militarism defines the policies and strategies of the US Empire there is no remedy for the challenges of lumpen power in its ‘backyard’. And Washington has nothing on offer to recapture a dominant presence in Latin America. The world market is defeating the empire. Latin America’s twenty-first century capitalists are leading the way to further decline in imperial power.

### Ethics- Capitalism Prevents Ethics

#### Capitalism is devoid of ethics—it objectifies all people and inter-personal relations.

Lamothe 12,

(Ryan LaMothe, Professor of Theology at St. Meinrad College, 7 July 2012, “The Spirits of Capitalism and Christianity and Their Impact on the Formation of Healthcare Leaders”, Journal of Religion and Health, 7/9/13 SS, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10943-012-9631-8/fulltext.html>)

The third point deals with the symbol system itself. In contending that capitalism fosters an acquisitive disposition and contractual-functional relationships, I am also arguing that it is devoid of symbols that found and support attitudes and actions of care toward others. Consider any system of morality, and one will find that it promotes various forms of caring relations, wherein individuals are, first and foremost, recognized and treated as persons. These ethical symbol systems (e.g., religions, philosophies) also include ways to understand when mutual-personal relationships go awry (e.g., sin, vice, injustice) and the means to repair these relationships (e.g., reconciliation, virtue, justice). Capitalism is a complex symbol system aimed at financial relations; it is not a moral system, but strictly a financial one. Clear evidence of this is seen in the lack of an ethics statement for the American Economists Association, National Association of Business Economics,7 or the Society of Government Economists. Similarly, Sowell and Jacoby reject any notion of justice when considering so-called price gouging in Florida. The concept of justice or morality simply does not apply, they believe, and, therefore, caring for those who are suffering becomes the concern of others. Any repair of relationships is framed in terms of contract and function vis-à-vis the aims of productivity, profit, economic exchange, etc. This said, I am not suggesting that economists or business people are amoral or fail to use moral standards in their application of the rules of capitalism, but the moral systems they use are grafted onto capitalism and are not a part of capitalism itself (Weber 1992). This can be seen in the shifting mores that Robert Reich portrays in his book, Supercapitalism. Fifty years ago, he argues, many business leaders acted like corporate statesmen concerned about the community and society. Today, given global competition and deregulation, corporations fight to retain market share and profit, more often than not, overlooking social concerns. Of course, many corporations contribute to a wide variety of social projects, but with the aim of making the corporation more appealing to consumers. The point here is that capitalism is not a moral system, but a financial one. Confusing the two, which occurs frequently, obscures the fundamental limitations of capitalism vis-à-vis mutual-personal relations and community.¶ In sum, capitalism as a symbol system founds and promotes the disposition of acquisitiveness and functional-contractual relationships (I-It relations) and only accidentally mutual-personal relations. This means that recognition of the worker as a “person” is subordinate to recognition of him/her as an object—a means to economic ends. More particularly, capitalism as a symbol system objectifies and commodifies loyalty and confidence in that loyalty toward other persons is subordinate to loyalty to the overarching market system. In addition, capitalism, as a symbol system, founds financial relations and behaviors of economic exchange and not moral relations whereby one is concerned about the Other as person (Levinas 1969, 1981). That is, there is no core symbol that upholds and reinforces the belief that the individual human being is first and foremost, a person, which is a foundational limitation of capitalism as a symbol system. One could say that the capitalism as a symbol system is completely non-Kantian in this regard, which means that it can support and regulate social relations vis-à-vis financial matters, but not communal relations and the common good. Since capitalism as a symbol system exists in relation to other moral symbol systems (e.g., religions, political philosophies), its depersonalizing effects are often mitigated. In other words, mutual-personal relations, morality and care are grafted onto capitalism, limiting its less savory effects

### Impact –Environmental Destruction

**The economic imbalances of societies are at the heart of environmental destruction and warfare, be skeptical of “natural” disasters, they exist as results of exploitation rather than divine happenings**

**Carey 09**

(Mark Carey, assistant professor of history at Washington and Lee University where he teaches Latin American and environmental history. He won the 2008 ¶ Leopold-Hidy Prize for his article, "The History of Ice: How Glaciers Became an ¶ Endangered Species (Environmental History, July 2007), April 2009, “Latin American Environmental History: Current Trends, Interdisciplinary Insights, and¶ Future Directions”, Jstor, 7/6/13 SS, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40608469)

DISASTER SCHOLARS ARE AMONG the most prominent to blur nature-culture ¶ dichotomies, and this is a research area where historians have made important ¶ historiographical contributions. They underscore the social roots of catastrophe by demonstrating how marginalized populations suffer disproportionately when ¶ catastrophes occur. The same historical processes that make populations vulnerable ¶ to so-called "natural" disasters-such as race and class divisions or land and resource ¶ loss- also contribute to warfare and revolutionary movements. Within nations and ¶ on a global scale, **power imbalances and economic inequality are thus at the center of ¶ disasters and wars**. Disaster studies in Latin America generally focus on earthquakes, floods, and ¶ weather-related catastrophes such as hurricanes, El Niño, and drought.77 Earthquake ¶ research tends to focus on single events, such as Lima in 1746, San Juan, Argentina in ¶ 1944, Huaraz, Peru in 1970, or Mexico City in 1985, among others.78 Scholars examining ¶ these earthquakes uncover not only the disaster impacts but also the politics of relief ¶ and reconstruction. Charles Walker, for example, argues that the 1746 earthquake- ¶ tsunami in Peru provided a clean slate for enlightened leaders to implement new ¶ reforms that challenged elite authority and reigning social hierarchies.79 Provocative ¶ studies on Caribbean hurricanes have unearthed both the social underpinnings of ¶ disaster vulnerability and the short- and long-term implications of disasters, such ¶ as Cuba's altered economy and closer relations with the United States following the ¶ three deadly 1840s hurricanes that Louis Pérez examines.80 El Niño scholarship has ¶ increasingly expanded beyond Peru to emphasize scientific, political, social, and even ¶ cultural aspects.81 ¶ Drought research is notable for its integration of climatic data into social analysis. ¶ Georgina Endfield links the changing climate to human vulnerability in colonial ¶ Mexico. This approach not only grounds her analysis in the social landscape of New ¶ Spain but also merges climate and water issues with disaster and agrarian studies. In a study of a recent El Niño event in Mexico, Hallie Eakin also focuses on household ¶ vulnerability to identify which regions, families, and communities were best (and least) ¶ able to adapt to extreme weather events. Both Eakin and Endfield demonstrate how ¶ climatic vulnerability was produced historically and stemmed from social, political, ¶ and economic conditions rather than simple "acts of God."82 Scholars have also studied ¶ drought in Northeast Brazil.83 While analyzing drought's profound impact on people, ¶ land, and livelihoods, they also analyze techno-scientific responses and the politics and ¶ discourse of disaster. Many of these studies increasingly probe the power dimensions of ¶ drought. Timothy Finan reveals how Brazilian elites manipulated drought discourse to ¶ accumulate wealth and power.84 Globally, Mike Davis suggests that millions died in late ¶ nineteenth century El Niño events-which generated drought in Brazil-because of the ¶ "fatal meshing of extreme events between the world climate system and the late Victorian ¶ world economy": western European imperial powers had taken control of local people's ¶ land and labor, and thus their ability to grow and procure food.85 Climatic disasters ¶ sometimes produced surprising historical changes, too. Glacier melting that triggered ¶ massive floods and avalanches in Peru also fostered new scientific studies, inspired ¶ innovative engineering projects, jump-started economic modernization campaigns, and ¶ provided platforms for fresh political agendas from within and beyond the Andes.86 ¶ Wars account for another type of disaster. And environmental analyses of war ¶ in Latin America, which tend to focus on post-i96os Central America, echo Davis's ¶ condemnations of the ways in which the global economy and geopolitics create ¶ vulnerable populations and cause disasters. In contrast to most environmental histories ¶ of warfare that examine the effects of weapons, science, technology, and military ¶ resource consumption, the small historiography on Latin America emphasizes the ¶ environmental dimensions leading to war as well as consequences.87 William Durham's ¶ analysis of the 1969 Honduras-El Salvador Soccer War illuminates the role of ecology ¶ and environmental conflicts. He shows how resource scarcity and land loss drove ¶ 300,000 Salvadorans to emigrate into an already strained situation in Honduras.88 ¶ Daniel Faber makes this point more broadly and emphatically, arguing that "Marxist ¶ and socialist theory should place the ecological crisis at the center of any analysis ¶ of revolution and imperialism in Central America."89 For Faber, capitalism produces ¶ multiple environmental effects that include warfare as well as the overexploitation ¶ of natural resources and the transformation of the peasantry from subsistence to the ¶ capitalist export sector. These social studies of warfare and disasters in Central America ¶ link with more recent scholarship on environmental justice.90 They also point to the ¶ importance of understanding social relations and power dynamics- the fundamentals ¶ of social history- inherent in past human-environment interactions’

### Impact—Ecosystems

#### Consumption causes environmental destruction at an unsustainable rate

**Schor 2005**

(Juliet B., Boston College Department of Sociology, “Prices and quantities: Unsustainable consumption and the global economy”, November 15th 2006, Ecological Economics, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204>, accessed 7/5/13, JK)

The ecological unsustainability of current consumption patterns is now well documented ([Vitousek et al., 1986](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib41), [Vitousek et al., 1997](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib42), [Meadows et al., 1992](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib18), [Worldwide Fund for Nature, 1999](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib51) and [Wilson, 2002](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib47)). According to ecological footprint analysis, the world passed the point of sustainability in 1978 ([Wackernagel et al., 2002](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib44)). Direct measures of the state of global planetary resources, such as the comprehensive ecosystem assessment done by WRI, the World Bank, the UNDP and the UNEP find that ecosystems are in decline virtually everywhere ([World Resources Institute et al., 2000](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib49)). Even economists, a group that has traditionally been dismissive of scientific assessments of declining natural capital, have begun to recognize that the current scale of consumption is not sustainable. A joint project by Stanford ecologists and some of the world's most distinguished economists reported, in a recent paper, that the answer to the question “Are we consuming too much?” might well be yes ([Arrow et al., 2004](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib1)).¶ Much of the literature on sustainable consumption has focused on technological solutions. Currently popular approaches include notions such as eco-efficiency, Factor 10, the Natural Step, the hydrogen economy and bio-mimicry ([McDonough and Braungaurt, 2002](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib17), [Beynus, 2002](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib2), [Rifkin, 2002](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib25) and [Hawken et al., 1999](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib10)). Some of the appeal of technological approaches is that they represent the economist's “free lunch.” Advocates of technological solutions argue that more intelligent design and technological innovation can dramatically reduce, or even stop the depletion of ecological resources, as well as eliminate toxic chemicals and ecosystem disruption. The popularity of technological solutions is also attributable to the fact that they are apolitical, and do not challenge macrostructures of production and consumption. In particular, they fail to address increases in the scale of production and consumption, sometimes even arguing that such increases are not unsustainable, if enough natural-capital-saving technical change occurs.¶ By contrast, I argue that a purely technological approach will fail, because the incentives to increase the scale of consumption are too powerful. The experience of the last few decades is that with many consumer goods and practices, and especially the crucial case of fossil-fuel consumption, increases in scale have outpaced technological improvements. The example of vehicles is well known. The effect of cleaner cars has been outweighed by the acquisition of more vehicles, more miles driven per vehicle, and larger vehicles. Similarly, improvements in residential energy technologies have been counter-balanced by larger homes and more energy-using appliances, so that US residential energy use has not declined, despite substantial improvements in efficiency. Indeed, total residential energy use continues to increase (United States Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, available at [http://www.intensityindicators.pnl.gov/residential.html](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=externObjLink&_locator=url&_issn=09218009&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_plusSign=%2B&_targetURL=http%253A%252F%252Fwww.intensityindicators.pnl.gov%252Fresidential.html)). These examples suggest that technological change is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for achieving sustainability. Indeed, the paradox of the current moment is striking—never before have the technological means for achieving sustainability been more promising, yet actual rates of ecological degradation are at record levels.¶ A central cause of that degradation is the growth of US private consumption. As is widely recognized, US private consumption currently entails a globally disproportionate use of resources, as measured by ecological footprint, measures of material weight, and numerous other indices and estimates ([Wackernagel, 1999](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204" \l "bib43) and [Wernick, 1997](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib46)). The 1990s and early 2000s have been a period of rapid consumption growth for the average household, as consumption outpaced income growth, and savings rates declined ([Schor, 1998](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204" \l "bib31)). Between 1993 and 2004, real personal consumption expenditures per capita rose from $19,593 to $25,973 (2000 dollars), or 33% ([CEA, 2005:247](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800905003204#bib5)), Table B-31

### Impact—Racism

**Capitalism perpetuates racism through its unequal division of labor and resources.**

**Brodkin ’05** (Karen, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology at UCLA, “Xenophobia, the State, and Capitalism,” American Ethnologist Vol. 32, No. 4, Nov. 2005, pg. 519-520 [Jstor](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3805342?&Search=yes&searchText=capitalism&searchText=racism&list=hide&searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3FQuery%3D%2528%2528capitalism%2529%2BAND%2B%2528racism%2529%2529%26Search%3DSearch%26gw%3Djtx%26prq%3D%2528%2528capital*%25) SM)

**In the United States, and in the global economy, more broadly, racism's resonance rests on institutionalized and persistent racial and ethnic segregation in the labor force, in neighborhoods, and in public space** (Brodkin 2000). **This segregation of some into the worst jobs, schools, and ¶ neighborhoods is the foundation for institutionalized ¶ racialization projects, whereby new groups of immigrants ¶ become racial Others. White Americans have limited interaction with new immigrants and experience them as a shadowy population of aliens.** The Bush administration ¶ has rivaled European governments in Islamophobic state ¶ policies and discourse, yet Muslims are not the primary ¶ focus of popular xenophobia in the United States. Certainly, a virulent niche market exists for Islamophobia ¶ in the United States among an unsavory coalition of ¶ the political and religious Right, including a Jewish ¶ Right. Still, many more **Americans stereotype Mexican and Central American immigrants for taking U.S. jobs and taking advantage of U.S. public services**, in much ¶ the same way that Western Europeans blame Turks and ¶ other Muslims. I suspect that popular resonance of state-promoted ¶ Islamophobia in Western Europe rests on earlier decades ¶ of immigration of workers from the Middle East. Much ¶ of the working class for Europe's post-World War II ¶ rebuilding and reindustrialization came from Turkey and former North African colonies. These "guest workers," like ¶ **undocumented immigrants in the United States, were ¶ vulnerable to exploitation because of state-imposed restrictions on work allowed and conditions of residence**, ¶ more generally. To better understand why Islamophobia ¶ strikes a popular chord in Europe today, one might ask ¶ about the ethnic composition of the late 20th-century ¶ European working class, about the patterns of occupational and residential segregation, about state policies toward immigrant workers, and about whether unions ¶ and progressive political forces represented their interests ¶ in the fifties, sixties, and seventies. Was there a discourse ¶ of domestic antiracism on the European left? Anti-guest ¶ worker sentiments may well have been antecedents and ¶ foundations of today's discourses about "unassimilable" ¶ Muslims destroying European civilization. The particular ¶ hostility toward Turkey and Islam extends outward to ¶ "the Balkans" and is part of a longer pattern in prosperous ¶ northern and western Europe that views its southern and ¶ eastern neighbors, who come as job seekers more than ¶ as investors, as unassimilable Others. **In** other words, to ¶ Bunzl's argument about the role of the state-superstate, I would add that anthropologists **seeking to understand ¶ the bases of widespread embrace** or not **of racist policies also look to the ways capitalism joins governments in organizing the daily life of work and social space.**

### Impact – Media

**Globalization enables mass media to simultaneously continue the metaphor of colonialism, and leaves knowledge int the hands of the elite.**

**Ambirajan 2000** (S. Ambirajan, recurring writer and Phd. For Economic and Political Weekly, “Globalisation, Media and Culture,” Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 35, No. 25 (Jun. 17-23, 2000, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4409414 .SM)

**Cultural penetration in the modern globalized and liberalized world is not achieved through violent conquest or direct economic domination. Globalization and liberalization are culturally loaded policies because the underlying ideological bases to be found in ideas such as 'free-market', 'progress' and 'intellectual freedom' imply a certain kind of cultural environment. Thus to get the best out of globalization and liberalization, one has also to become assimilated into a uniform global culture dominated by a few advanced nations.** While national cultures will be under great stress as a result of the onslaught of a globalized culture, **it is necessary to emphasize how regional sub-cultures can also be hegemonised by the media controlled by metropolitan centers**. How does modern media serve this peaceful spiritual annexation? What are the implications? Before we make an attempt to examine this question, a caveat has to be entered. Cultural invasion of the modern globalized era is very different from similar penetration in the past. All earlier forms of cultural invasion followed other kinds of invasion and on the basis of a 'Book' or an ideology that was considered morally or ethically superior and good for the invaded. In short, it was not 'demand-driven'. But it is somewhat different although it still emanates from one or two sources. **The two core principles are (a) market knows best (individualism); and (b) the satisfaction of the individual through** supplying what he wants **(hedonism**). Ithiel de Sola Pool clearly points¶ this out: "The **Americanization of world culture** so often commented on and deplored **might be better described as the discovery of what cultural tastes actually bare and adoption of those into American media. If American pop culture is successful around the world** - and it is - **it is by a circular process. American commerce seeks to reflect world cultural tastes, the product in turn feeds back into the system and reinforces that which was already found popular**" (op cit). Similarly **if Indian or Chinese food, Japanese martial arts or other elements of Asian culture penetrate into the western world, it only shows the power of the market** and the desire for gratification on the part of individuals. **Markets in their turn could be easily manipulated to manufacture cultural tastes** as Vance Packard pointed out in his Hidden Persuaders long ago. The most interesting issues here are how **the market and media have acted symbiotically to produce the current global culture. First, the target audience is not known for message giver to be able to tailor the message to suit the audience. The concerned information tends to be general, devoid of diversity. Suppose there is a media presentation of some folk art. The emphasis invariably is on the general structure without any reference to the delicate nuances that could prevail in different parts of the region. Those who think they have learnt about that art form will obviously be mistaken.** Over a period of time**, this generalized model will become the standard to be adopted by every practitioner. The same thing spills over into the use of the language. Language use is essentially regional and local specific. In order to cater to a wide variety of audience a neutral type of language is fostered in the media**. Alternatively **one particular usage be- comes the universal model**. Second, with a vast heterogeneous audience, **the message giver is compelled to bring down the level of discourse to the lowest common denominator. The mass media cannot distinguish between different levels of comprehension and under- standing available in the audience. Hence there is a tendency to pitch all messages to the lowest level of mental capacity. The result is** what the eminent journalist Carl Bernstein (1994) calls creation of a "true **idiot culture**". Ashesays, for the "first time in history the weird and **the stupid and the vulgar are becoming our** cultural norm, even our **cultural ideal**". In order to attract audience, **media presents knowledge in slick, pre-digested, easy-to-under- stand capsules**. According to the social critic, Jean Baudrillard (1993), **the close- up universe of the television screens, tabloid newspapers and glossy magazines has destroyed the possibilities of critical examination and reflection, as phenomena are brought down to terminals of a bland, frenetically moving culture**. Over a period, the public craves only this kind of presentation of information about phenomena. **It induces people to want simpleanswers to difficult problems, and so interest in truth which could be hard complex and subtle, recedes fast. This could have a profoundly anti-democratic consequence for the spread of knowledge. The mass media approach lessens people's interest in what has been called "reading** in the old, archaic, private, silent sense". This is a "specialized skill and avocation" as George Steiner puts it, "as it was in the scriptoria and libraries of the monasteries during the so-called Dark Ages. The wish to attend to a demanding text, to master the grammar, the arts of memory, the tactics of repose and concentration, may **once again become the practice of an elite**, of a mandarinate of silences" (cited by Steve Wasserman in NPQ symposium, op cit) Generally, interest in studies requiring hard analytical effort declines in favor of soft disciplines among the new generation. Third, as the necessity of persuading a far larger group of people in a variety of social and geographical spaces arises, **a certain standardization of knowledge becomes inevitable**. This standardization is invariably path dependent because established forms already developed in leading western countries tend to be accepted. Weights and measures, national income computation systems and even the very currency system to name a few become standardized, and **invariably their origins are in the west.** They also in general tend to favor the western countries. An ex- ample is the Mercator's Projection used in cartography which "distorts the comparative size of continent all and masses, as well as evoking a Eurocentricvision of the Mediterranean as the center of the world" [Sreberny-Muhammadi1997:52]. Fourth, being a ruthlessly competing world, some **knowledge systems which do not have adequate support tend to lose out with fewer systems thriving**. **Size and cost effectiveness become crucial in the mass mediated context. This shows up in the flow of knowledge and culture communication from the developed to the less developed world.** For example local material (e g, television programs or traditional street drama) cannot effectively¶ compete with foreign (e g, American television) sources. Even within national boundaries, size and scale determined media can ignore the tastes and interests of minorities and marginal groups. The economics of globalized media can hurt local economies. Even European media interests feel the pinch of the far cheaper American imports. But of course we should not think that it is an irreversible process. Between 1975 and 1991, the flow of cultural goods from the developed to the less developed countries has gone down and the flow from LDC to DCs has increased even though in absolute terms DCs still hold the advantage. The share of LDC with 77 per cent of population in world¶ export of cultural goods is only 31.8 per cent whereas the share of DCs with 23 per cent of populationremainedat68.2 per cent in 1991.¶ Fifth, while the enormous advances in telecommunications have spawned a mammoth entertainment industry to cater¶ to a worldwide population, its possibilities of expanding the knowledge frontier are limited to a few affluent countries. In countries like the US and the UK, vast quantities of data and information are available that could be accessed easily through educational/research centers. These are not available in less developed countries and as technologies improve, this informational gap can only widen beyond comprehension. Ithiel de Sola Pool points out that "In 20 years, systems such as MEDLARS (Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System) or the New York Times online information system will be widely used in this country. Given the sophisticated technology required for time-shared data networks with remote access, the developing countries will fall increasingly behind"(op cit). The provision of such educational facilities will require enormous investment, but private capital (local or foreign) will not be forthcoming as these are not market driven. Sixth, **Cultural forms that developed organically during the long course of human history have been altered to suit very different purposes thanks to** novel means of communication made possible by **mass media**. Thus **religion which developed initially as a mode of communion of the individual with the infinite has become an instrument of political mobilization**. Similarly **art forms which originated to give expression to the creative urges of individuals and societies have been transformed to serve** very different - some would say **philistine - ends. For example the art of drama** that developed since classical Greek times and nurtured in many civilizations through the works of Kalidasa, Shakespeare, Henrik Ibsen, and Bertold Brecht and which is **one of the highest achievements of human civilization is now transformed to be a tool to sell toothpaste or washing detergents.** Martin Esslin who was head of the BBC radio drama points out that **television commercials and indeed "all the other forms of dramatic mass entertainment and mass manipulation" have become part of modem culture and cannot be wished away**. In his view they have adapted well the old dramatic arts for new uses. The television commercial after all is drama that is an **"omnipresent, all- pervasive, continuously available, and unending stream of entertainment for the vast majority of individuals".** By looking at myths at the base of our modern culture, they are "no less than Greek tragedy". Though the average television commercial may not use plot, character and spoken dialogue as seriously as the great dramatist s of the past, they "are essentially dramatic, because basically they use **mimetic action to produce a semblance of real life**, and the basic ingredients of drama- character and a story line - are present in the great majority of them, either manifestly or by implication" [Esslin 1979: 96- 108]. Similar analysis of other art forms - music, painting, sculpture, etc, - could easily be made along these lines. Finally, all traditional cultures had set great store by ethical behavior with all its complications in theory and practice. Pedro Gilberto Gomes has pointed out that human beings "are imbued with a moral conscience that deter- mines their daily actions" which arose out of a "complex, social, familial, political,cultural, and religious" context. Because media professionals are also human, he assumes that they would also abide by¶ certain self-imposed ethical principles. The way **media functions in a dog-eat-dog world where to anything goes competitive increase coverage and profits**, this hope is naive. Information that comes through the media is invariably slanted. Sometimes it is just to boost circulation by highlighting certain bizarre and titillating aspects of an event. **News is presented to suit one's own ideological position with the intention of converting the audience**. John Fiske gives the classic example of American newspaper reporting on the Los Angeles rioting as a result of the Rodney King affair: "**the discourse of mobs and masses or senselessness and lawlessness absolves white society from any responsibility for the uprisings. By using this as their dominant discourse, the mainstream media were able to submerge both the broader social situation in which their role is so formative and the history of dominations of which they are themselves a product. The main- stream media's refusal to see anything from a point of view other than their own, repressed any alternative knowledge that there was an order, a purpose and a sense to the uprisings**"[Fiske 1994:180]. Worse still are the journalists who present slanted news to favor the diktats - overt and covert - of the proprietors of the media with their own particular axes to grind. Then there are the journalists who could easily be bribed. Hamish McDonald in his biography of Dhirubhai Ambani says: "Reliance was a pioneer of envelope journalism. A senior commercial journalist in Bombay recalls that journalists would get vouchers worth up to Rs 2,000 for goods at a Vimal retail outlet. Some in senior positions would get regular monthly payments, or issues of Reliance shares and debentures at par" [McDonald¶ 1998:75].¶

### Impact- Patriarchy

**Neoliberalism empirically initiates policies which enforce patriarchy. This will kill the critical intersection of patriarchy and capitalism which is key to the dismantling of both.**

**Motta ’13** (Sara C., Senior lecturer in politics at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “’We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For’ The Feminization of Resistance in Venezuela,” Latin American Perspectives, SagePub, 07/04/13, <http://lap.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/04/19/0094582X13485706>, SM)

**The women subjects of this analysis are** now all participants in the urban land committees and **residents of La Vega**, a shantytown with a half century of history and a population of up to 250,000. Situated in the southwestern hills surrounding the valley in which central Caracas stands, **La Vega is paradigmatic of the conditions of exclusionary patriarchal capitalist development** of the Punto Fijo period (1958–1998). The Punto Fijo pact between political elites of Acción Democrática (Democratic Action) and the Partido Social Cristiano de Venezuela (Venezuelan Social Christian Party) maintained a formal power- sharing democracy fueled by oil rents that excluded the political left. Although certain class-based groups were allowed in the party system, civil society remained **under the control of a male-led and male-dominated political culture and system, “democratically excluding women from power”’** (Friedman, 1998: 90; Rantala, 2009: 6). Thus **the key social subjects of this pact were capital and labor, and the practices of politics were highly patriarchal, reproducing a caste of men as the economic and political elite through a corporatist system of tightly controlled union and sectoral movements. When middle- and upper- class women did participate, it was** by consigning their housework to other women (such as those from La Vega), and they were often confined to tradi- ionally feminized roles **as political “housewives”** (Carosio, 2007; Friedman, 1998: 115–128; Rantala, 2009: 25–36). The rights that they won were often liberal bourgeois and excluded the needs and demands of poor and black women (Huggins Castañeda, 2010: 182–187). When women participated in left-wing popular politics such as the guerrilla movements of the 1960s and 1970s, their political practices often reflected the gendered and patriarchal norms of the Punto Fijo elites. A patriarchal political practice was often mirrored in the social and cultural realm. Here gendered characteristics were clearly marked. Machismo for **men was identified with power, rationality, and the public sphere of politics and the economy. Women were represented as the carriers of family and community, playing their roles in the domestic private sphere through a desexualized and dependent articulation of mother**, daughter, and wife. Yet, as in many other parts of Latin America, the nuclear family never took social root in working- class urban communities, and many poor urban families were headed by women relying on extended-family networks. As Giovanna Dalla Costa (1995: 96) notes, “the key figure in the family was the mother, who was the only real reference point, while the father was an inconstant and unpredictable figure.” Women-headed households, informal unions, and single motherhood were common, and such households tended to be among the poorest even during the petrodollar boom of the 1970s. This system began to disintegrate with the economic downturn initiated by Black Friday in 1983. Poverty rates climbed, and by 1996 65 percent of Venezuelans lived in poverty**. The implementation of neoliberal policies after 1989 reinforced the gendered nature of inequality and exclusion** and, in Venezuela as elsewhere, resulted in a marked and increasing feminization of poverty (Rantala, 2009: 6).

**Neoliberalism has led to a cutback in social aid programs. Women, who make up 70% of the worlds poor, are effected by this in an extreme way.¶**

**Jaggar ’01 (**Alison M. Jaggar, faculty at CU Boulder in 1990 and holds a joint appointment with the Women and Gender Studies Program. She is a College Professor of Distinction and a Research Coordinator at the Centre for the Study of Mind in Nature, University of Oslo, Norway. In 2011, Jaggar won the University of Colorado Gee Memorial Lectureship for advancing women, interdisciplinary scholarly contributions and distinguished teaching, “Is Globalization Good for Women?,” Comparative Literature, Vol. 53, No. 4, Autumn 2001, pg. 298-314, http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp)¶

**The most obviously gendered feature of neoliberalism is its worldwide cut-¶ backs in social programs. These cutbacks have affected women's economic status¶ even more adversely than men's, because women's responsibility for caring for children and other family members makes them more reliant on such programs.** In the global South, cuts in public health services have contributed to a **rise in maternal mortality**; in the global North, **making hospitals more "efficient" has involved discharging patients earlier-to be cared for at home by female family members. Reductions in social services have forced women to create survival strategies for their families by absorbing these reductions with their own unpaid labor**. **The effect of these strategies has been felt especially in the global South, where more work for women has resulted in higher school dropout rates for girls.** In addition, the introduction of **school fees in many Southern countries has made education unavailable to poorer children and especially to girls. Less education and longer hours of domestic work obviously contribute to women's¶ impoverishment by making it harder for them to attain well-paying jobs**.¶ The feminization of poverty was a term coined originally to describe the situation of women in the United States, but the phenomenon has now become global, and its scale is increasing. The United Nations reports that **women now comprise 70 percent of the world's 1.3 billion poor. Women's poverty in both North and South is linked with disturbing statistics on children's nutritional status, mortality and health. In many Southern countrie**s, including Zimbabwe, Zambia, Nicaragua, Chile and Jamaica, **the number of children who die before the age of one or five has risen sharply after decades of falling numbers.¶**

**Patriarchy, as part as the male dominated and capitalist state system, enables depriving women of work, right to sexual liberty, work space equality, and political representation.**

**Einspahr ’10** (Jennifer Einspahr, Associate Professor of Political Science,“Structural Domination and Structural Freedom: A Feminist Perspective,” Feminist Review 94, March 2010, 1-19, http://search.proquest.com/docview/212059658?accountid=7113.. SM)

More specifically, **patriarchy functions as a structure of domination**, in complex interactions **with other structures of domination, in part through men's exploitation of women**, or the 'systematic and unreciprocated transfer of powers from women to men ... The freedom, power, status, and self-realization of men is possible precisely because women work for them. **Gender exploitation has two aspects, transfer of the fruits of material labor to men and transfer of nurturing and sexual energies to men'** (Young, 1990: 50). For example, **although many individual women control greater amounts of resources than many individual men due to the intersections of class and race with gender, on average women continue to earn significantly less than men for the same work and have access to fewer material resources than men, not in small part due to the horizontal and vertical segregation of the labour market, women's underemployment, and women's participation in unremunerated labour in the 'private' sphere**. While such exploitation will take different forms for women who are privileged by the racial division of labour and those who are oppressed by it, for example, such **systematic inequality nonetheless provides men as group with power over women as a group and constitutes a background condition of domination**.¶ Men's sexual exploitation of women, or the systematic transfer of women's sexual energies to men, constitutes a blatant form of men's domination of women (and shows how patriarchy is bound up with heteronormativity as well). **Men, particularly those who are privileged by race or class, are systematically positioned to interfere in the sexual lives of women and girls, with impunity and in ways that are potentially arbitrary at the individual level, as evidenced by astonishingly high rates of sexual assault and miniscule rates of conviction for sex crimes.** However, **sexual exploitation affects the lives of women and girls whether or not they ever experience it in its most overt or violent forms**. Kathy Miriam makes this particularly clear in her discussion of male sex-right, or the **background assumption of men's implicit right to the sexual access to the bodies of women and girls.** Again underscoring the importance of maintaining a conceptual distinction between agency and freedom, she shows how women's negotiation of the conditions under which they will experience compulsory heterosexuality may be evidence of women's exercise of agency, or participation in the given structure, but it does not constitute freedom, which would entail a transformation of the dominant background conditions under which we operate. 6 **Sex-right is part of our background understanding of heteronormativity ... the assumption that men have a right of sexual access to women and girls allows for specific actions of coercion and aggression to take place**, but sex-right is not synonymous with those acts. From this perspective, new forms of girls' and women's sexual agency refer to new ways of living through heterorelations. However, as I have argued, it does not thereby follow that girls and women are therefore experiencing new sexual freedom . On the contrary, new forms of sexual agency - of participating in, living through, and experiencing heterorelations - may very well presuppose new forms of men's access to women and girls. (Miriam, 2007: 225; emphasis in original)¶ In accord with the concept of freedom as non-domination I develop here, exercising agency - and even resisting - is perfectly consistent with living under conditions of domination. That is, women may be able to determine, perhaps even to a large degree, how they will experience men's sex-right, but true freedom for women and girls (and arguably for men and boys as well) would require that male sex-right be abolished in both its material and symbolic guises.¶ **The state is instrumental in maintaining the conditions of women's domination as well**. As Lisa Brush argues, once we examine social and political conditions through a gender lens, and once we see gender as a social structure (Connell, 1987; Lorber, 1995), the state's role in structuring the conditions under which women can exercise their agency becomes clear.¶ **Looking through a gender lens at states and social policies allows analysts and activists to understand 'gendered doing' - gender as a principle of social organization** (the gender of governance), and its consequences for citizenship, democracy, and everyday life (the governance of gender) ... A gender lens shows the ways states and social policies construct, limit, and expand diverse women's economic, political, and sexual possibilities.¶ (Brush, 2003: 123)¶ Indeed, if the state is male (MacKinnon, 1982, 1991) or masculine (Brown, 1992), arguing normatively for women's freedom means taking seriously the role of the state in **'coercively and authoritatively constitut[ing] the social order in the interest of men as a gender, through its legitimizing norms, relation to society, and substantive policies**' (MacKinnon, 1982: 644). And indeed, the evidence shows that 'states govern gender through casework and through debates over economic development, through welfare policies as well as policies on violence against women' (Brush, 2003: 72). **The state inevitably plays a role in the construction and maintenance of gendered power relations, in its various and complex forms, and feminists ought to continue to challenge the ways in which the state enables women's domination**.¶ Finally, **states assure male domination by excluding women (and other oppressed groups) from political processes altogether, thus 'usurping' their power to determine the rules under which they will live**. Returning to the concept of non-domination, for classical republican thinkers¶ power could be problematic not only because it was arbitrary or unchecked - not only because of the vertical relationship of control [domination] it established between commander and commanded, owner and property - but also if it was unduly concentrated; that is, because of the horizontal distribution of involvement it established among those who held imperium [public power] and those who did not. (Markell, 2008: 25)¶.

**Capitalism is the root cause of patriarchy. As long as materialism reigns, patriarchy remains a necessity, especially in resource cursed countries like Venezuela**

**Farrelly ’11** (Colin Farrelly, Professor and Queen’s National Scholar at the Department of Political Studies of Queen’s University, “Patriarchy and Historical Materialism,” Hypatia vol. 26, Winter, 2011, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01151.x/full.. SM)

**Analytical Marxism, once viewed through the lens of a feminist analysis**, has, I believe, the potential to provide us with a powerful explanatory account of patriarchy. Patterns of patriarchy vary in accordance with different productive forces (for example, raw materials, technology, and so on). This Marxist account of historical materialism **places a strong emphasis on the female contribution to humanity’s productive forces, a contribution that has been so vital to our historical struggle to overcome scarcity that women have been subjugated to ensure that the requirements of basic materialism were satisfied**.¶ The story of civilization, argues Lerner, ‘‘is **the story of men and women struggling up from necessity**, from their helpless dependence on nature, to freedom and their partial mastery over nature.’’ **In this struggle, she continues, ‘‘women were longer confined to species-essential activities than men and were therefore more vulnerable to being disadvantaged’**’ (Lerner 1986, 52). **Women have played an invaluable role in the creation and nurturing of offspring and knowledge. But this social function has come at a deep cost to the autonomy and rights of women as a class. Liberation from the most oppressive forms of patriarchy becomes possible only when society’s productive forces have reached a level where less oppressive relations of production are feasible and necessary: relations that permit women greater control over their reproductive capacities and labor power. These relations of production permit women to accumulate political influence, which in turn influences the superstructure of society**.¶ A diversified economy is not the only factor that helps integrate women into the paid labor force. The latter is aided by lower fertility rates, which only be- came feasible with improvements in nutrition, child mortality, birth control, and a host of other public health measures. As female labor shifts from pre- dominantly reproductive and caring labor to the paid labor force, we see greater participation and empowering of women. This is why women in affluent, liberal democracies enjoy more freedom and autonomy than do women in less developed countries.¶ **The ‘‘resource curse’’ perpetuates patriarchy because it constrains the development of the productive forces that lead to more emancipatory relations of production**. As the passage from the World Bank study cited at the beginning of this paper notes, ‘‘resource-poor economies have had to rely more heavily on labor intensive development and thus have depended more on women’s economic participation’’ (Mena Development Report 2004, 7). The Development Thesis maintains that **new relations of production arise when existing relations of production constrain the development of the productive forces. Countries plagued by the ‘‘resource curse’’ have little reason to transform the patriarchal relations of production of the past**. For the productive forces of these societies do not include the labor-intensive development typical of industrialization. Thus a country’s **resources have a profound impact on the degree and kind of patriarchy present in it.¶ The different patterns of patriarchy we find between resource-rich and resource-poor countries suggests that historical materialism offers insightful emancipatory knowledge that could be applied to redress patriarchy in societies today**. Of course the next important step is to consider what prescriptions we can derive from the diagnosis this account of historical materialism provides. I hope the arguments advanced in this paper will help bridge the di- vide between analytical Marxism and feminism, and in doing so help shed some new light on the issue of how patriarchy can best be redressed in the world today

### Impact- Poverty

**The globalizing process of the 1AC increases the suppression of the lower classes and entrenches poverty, studies prove**

**Robinson 04**,

(William Robinson, PhD and professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, April 2004, “Global Crisis and Latin America“, Bulletin of Latin American Research, 7/8/13 SS, http://www.ncsu.edu/acontracorriente/winter\_05/Robinson.pdf)

The hegemony of transnational capital and new patterns of post-Fordist “flexible”¶ accumulation has involved a restructuring of the capital-labor relation in Latin America¶ and worldwide. In this new relation, capital has abandoned reciprocal obligations to labor¶ in the employment contract with the emergence of new post-Fordist “flexible” regimes of¶ accumulation, which require “flexible” and “just in time”—that is casualized and¶ contingent—labor. And states, with their transmutation from developmentalist to Neoliberal, have all but abandoned obligations to poor and working majorities.¶ Globalization, hence, has been associated with a dramatic sharpening of social¶ inequalities, increased polarization, and the persistence of widespread poverty in Latin¶ America (table 6) [Roberts, 2002; Portes and Hoffman, 2003; Green, 1995]. This reflects¶ the broader pattern of global social polarization (see next section). Between 1980 and¶ 1990 average per capital income dropped by an unprecedented 11 percent, so that by¶ 1990 most of the region's inhabitants found that their income had reverted to 1976 levels¶ (World Bank, 1997). The absolute number of the poor also increased throughout the¶ 1980s and 1990s. Between 1980 and 1992, some 60 million new people joined the ranks¶ of the poor. The number of people living in poverty went from 136 million in 1980, to¶ 196 million in 1992, and then to 230 million in 1995, an increase from 41 percent to 44¶ percent, and then to 48 percent, respectively, of the total population (CEPAL, various¶ years)

### Impact- Poverty

#### The nature of Capitalism makes poverty and exploitation inevitable, it needs new forms of production to create a surplus of profit, specifically in Latin America.

**Kat 2001**

(Claudio, an economist, is a professor and researcher at the University of Buenos Aires, “The Manifesto and Globalization”, November 6th 2001, <http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/2943_11lap01.pdf>, accessed 7/8/13, JK)

Since the 1980s, the new international rivalry on the production level has¶ caused a spectacular wave of mergers that have required reduction of costs¶ and an increase in productivity. It has also produced an increase in the centralization¶ of capital (in no important sector are there more than ten huge competitors¶ operating), the formation of complexes that integrate services to industry’s¶ requirements, and the proliferation of agreements between firms to¶ ensure the distribution of the various goods. The substitution of the label¶ “Made in such-and-such a country” with “Made by such-and-such a company”¶ symbolizes this transformation. The “global factory” and the “global¶ product” are not yet the norm, but this is the central tendency of capitalism¶ today.¶ An important theoretical implication of this process is the potential transformation¶ in the determination of prices under the law of value. A significant¶ portion of the production undertaken in the internal space of these internationalized¶ firms is based on the “transfer price” administered by managers¶ who are to some extent independent of market instability. Thus, a fracture¶ emerges in the classical process of the determination of average profit and the¶ costs of production based on national prices and currency, contributing to a¶ regional structuring of new monetary standards and policies regarding subsidies¶ and tariffs.¶ At the same time, the internationalization of production is responsible for¶ the dynamic acceleration of innovation in the field of information technologies.¶ It simultaneously constitutes a great stimulus to the ongoing technological revolution and is the determinant of its major contradictions (developed¶ in Katz, 1998). On this point, two major ideas in the Manifesto have special¶ relevance: the characterization of the bourgeoisie as a class that “cannot¶ exist without constantly revolutionizing the means of production” and the¶ appearance of an “epidemic of overproduction” as a consequence of this idiosyncrasy.¶ Both phenomena are evident today. Under capitalism, the multiplication¶ of new goods and forms of production is indissolubly linked to the production¶ of surpluses in relation to the purchasing capacity of the population.¶ It is for this reason that poverty, unemployment, and exploitation are increasing¶ alongside the internationalization of the productive process. Latin America¶ is one of the regions most affected by this transformation.

**Impact- Poverty**

#### Capitalism creates unemployment; technology and fluctuations in the market.

**Harriss-White 2006**

(Barbara, Professor of Development Studies, Oxford University “Poverty and Capitalism, Economic and Political Weekly, April 7th 2006, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/4418024.pdf?acceptTC=true>, accessed 7/8/13, JK)

Capitalism does not only search for cheap and even unwaged labour. Two mechanismsc two mechanisms create unemployment. First, technological change: capitalism permeates society through a dynamic process based on the logic of growth and profit in which the productivity of wage labour is continually enhanced by machines.1**0 By itself** the elasticity of labour absorption with respect to growth declines **- and indeed** this is happening in **agriculturally advanced regions of** India now. **1** The second mechanism concerns the ways in which markets make adjustments to fluctuations. Under capitalism, all markets are related to each other in ways which are structured **(at the very least through norms about future expectations).**In practice supply, demand, property rights, prices and contracts are structured in densely instituted and specific ways. One of the elements of such a structure is the physical nature and cultural meaning of things transformed as commodities. For one instance, labour is a commodity with consciousness, which may reflect on and resist contracts in markets; labour is also not produced for sale. **For another, money is not only a commodity but also a stock of wealth. As a result, its value vis-a-vis other commodities is, and must be, stickier. It will change more slowly than commodity prices do.** As Patnaik (2005)has recently argued, it then follows that excess demand between money and commodities requires quantity adjustments in commodities and labour. **So** the dynamic of capitalism requires there to be idle capacity in machinery and plant, cash balances and unemployment regardless of the impact on labour of technological change. The result is the creation of pools of unemployed labour.12 Some people float in and out of work while others are seasonal migrants and a particularly stagnant pool is filled by those without work for long periods.These reserves of unemployed people are functionally useful to capital since their very existence disciplines and disempowers those in work, discouraging them politically from struggles over the distribution of wages and profits which might result in their being deprived of¶ livelihood**s- and depressing the wages of¶ workers by their mere existence.** In the¶ absence of state intervention, they reproduce¶ a system which is self-reinforcing.

### Impact-Patriarchy

**Neoliberalism empirically initiates policies which enforce patriarchy. This will kill the critical intersection of patriarchy and capitalism which is key to the dismantling of both.**

**Motta ’13** (Sara C., Senior lecturer in politics at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “’We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For’ The Feminization of Resistance in Venezuela,” Latin American Perspectives, SagePub, 07/04/13, <http://lap.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/04/19/0094582X13485706>, SM)

**The women subjects of this analysis are** now all participants in the urban land committees and **residents of La Vega**, a shantytown with a half century of history and a population of up to 250,000. Situated in the southwestern hills surrounding the valley in which central Caracas stands, **La Vega is paradigmatic of the conditions of exclusionary patriarchal capitalist development** of the Punto Fijo period (1958–1998). The Punto Fijo pact between political elites of Acción Democrática (Democratic Action) and the Partido Social Cristiano de Venezuela (Venezuelan Social Christian Party) maintained a formal power- sharing democracy fueled by oil rents that excluded the political left. Although certain class-based groups were allowed in the party system, civil society remained **under the control of a male-led and male-dominated political culture and system, “democratically excluding women from power”’** (Friedman, 1998: 90; Rantala, 2009: 6). Thus **the key social subjects of this pact were capital and labor, and the practices of politics were highly patriarchal, reproducing a caste of men as the economic and political elite through a corporatist system of tightly controlled union and sectoral movements. When middle- and upper- class women did participate, it was** by consigning their housework to other women (such as those from La Vega), and they were often confined to tradi- ionally feminized roles **as political “housewives”** (Carosio, 2007; Friedman, 1998: 115–128; Rantala, 2009: 25–36). The rights that they won were often liberal bourgeois and excluded the needs and demands of poor and black women (Huggins Castañeda, 2010: 182–187). When women participated in left-wing popular politics such as the guerrilla movements of the 1960s and 1970s, their political practices often reflected the gendered and patriarchal norms of the Punto Fijo elites. A patriarchal political practice was often mirrored in the social and cultural realm. Here gendered characteristics were clearly marked. Machismo for **men was identified with power, rationality, and the public sphere of politics and the economy. Women were represented as the carriers of family and community, playing their roles in the domestic private sphere through a desexualized and dependent articulation of mother**, daughter, and wife. Yet, as in many other parts of Latin America, the nuclear family never took social root in working- class urban communities, and many poor urban families were headed by women relying on extended-family networks. As Giovanna Dalla Costa (1995: 96) notes, “the key figure in the family was the mother, who was the only real reference point, while the father was an inconstant and unpredictable figure.” Women-headed households, informal unions, and single motherhood were common, and such households tended to be among the poorest even during the petrodollar boom of the 1970s. This system began to disintegrate with the economic downturn initiated by Black Friday in 1983. Poverty rates climbed, and by 1996 65 percent of Venezuelans lived in poverty**. The implementation of neoliberal policies after 1989 reinforced the gendered nature of inequality and exclusion** and, in Venezuela as elsewhere, resulted in a marked and increasing feminization of poverty (Rantala, 2009: 6).

### Uniqueness--Cap Collapse Coming

Capitalism has produced an unsustainable global age---a single accident will collapse the entire economy.

**Redhead 2009** (Steve Redhead, Professor of Sport and Media Cultures at the University of Brighton in the UK, “MOBILE ACCELERATED NONPOSTMODERN CULTURE”, Working Papers in Mobile Accelerated Nonpostmodern Culture (MANC), 2009, Pg 5-8, JK)

Paul Virilio, the French urban theorist of speed and catastrophe is responsible (Virilio, 2007b: 68) for the development of the 0 of ‘claustropolis’ (which in his thinking has replaced cosmopolis). Dromomania is Virilio’s term for those obsessed with speed and a society where everyone has to keep moving and accelerating – a fitting label for our finance capitalism driven twenty-first century descent into global chaos. Virilio, too, spotted the potential future ‘integral accident’ in globalisation; the linking together of the world’s stock markets in the 1980s. He told Philippe Petit, prophetically, in interview in 1996, twelve years before the 2008 crash: ‘The speed of circulation has supplanted money. The production that resulted from this three-dimensional money is itself eliminated in favour of pure speculation, in other words a pure electronic game. The movement of dematerialisation which I analysed in reference to the city and the neighbour reappears in the case of money. The logic is exactly the same, in other words, the aesthetics of disappearance, and what is disappearing now is production and the money referent. We exceeded the limit of the speed of exchange with the Trading programme that combined the stock markets into one. Wall Street, London, Frankfurt and Tokyo are now just one stock market’. (Virilio with Petit, 1999: 107) Virilio also told Petit in the same interview that the 1987 stock exchange meltdown was ‘an accident’ waiting to happen (again): ‘With the acceleration following the transportation revolution of the last century, the number of accidents suddenly multiplied and sophisticated procedures had to be invented in order to control air, rail and highway traffic. With the current world-wide revolution in communication and telematics, acceleration has reached its physical limit, the speed of electromagnetic waves. So there is the risk not of a local accident in a particular location, but rather of a global accident that would affect if not the entire planet, then at least the majority of people concerned by these technologies. On this subject, consider the stock market crash of 1987that resulted from the implementation of the Programme Trading of automatic stock quotations on Wall Street. It is apparent that this new notion of the accident has nothing to do with the Apocalypse, but rather with the imperious necessity to anticipate in a rational way this kind of catastrophe by which the interactivity of telecommunications would reproduce the devastating effects of a poorly managed radioactivity – think about Chernobyl.’ (Virilio and Petit, 1999: 93) For Virilio ‘the stock market crash’ of 1987 was a ‘sign of what’s to come’ (Virilio and Petit, 1999: 91). In June 2007 he predicted that the ‘stock market…is in danger of crashing far more seriously than it did in 1929, since all the stock markets are now interconnected’ (Virilio and Lotringer, 2008: 230). Paul Virilio, arguably ‘the most provocative French cultural theorist on the contemporary intellectual scene’ (Armitage, 2001: 1) has not yet spawned his own online journal of ‘Virilio’ Studies unlike his compatriot, the late Jean Baudrillard (2). If it ever did exist it is a safe bet that the International Journal of Virilio Studies journal would feature strongly Virilio’s idea of the ‘accident’ and that the notion of ‘catastrophe’ would be a dominant theme. So would ‘bunker archaeology’. In the late 1950s a young Paul Virilio (Armitage, 2000, Armitage, 2001, Redhead, 2004a, Redhead, 2004b) first put pen to paper about the German bunkers he had begun photographing along the Atlantic coast. The work went on until 1965. The bunkers along the Atlantic Wall totalled 15,000 and were designed to repel Allied attack against occupied France. These bunkers had fascinated Virilio since he was a ten year old boy evacuated to Nantes in the Second World War. He always saw himself as a ‘blitzkreig baby’ or ‘war baby’ where he studies at the ‘university of disaster’ (Virilio, 2009b) and later was himself conscripted into the French army during the Algerian war of independence. Virilio subsequently published the very short piece ‘Bunker Archeologie’ (see translation in Redhead, 2004a: 11-13) and eventually a book called Bunker Archeology (Virilio, 2009a, English translation) following an original French edition and the exhibition of his collection of text and images on the bunkers at the Decorative Arts Museum in Paris in 1975. Sociologist Mike Gane has written, convincingly, of Paul Virilio’s ‘bunker theorising’ (Gane, 2000) and I have proposed a ‘bunker anthropology’
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### Uniqueness--Cap Collapse Coming
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(Redhead, 2009a). In these twenty-first century media heavy times we have all to some extent or other become historians of Virilio’s instant present where immediacy, instantaneity and ubiquity rule. For Virilio it was with globalisation, in the 1990s, through what he refers to as the ‘new technologies’, that we began to inhabit a world that is ‘foreclosed’: ‘Globalisation is a major catastrophe, it is the catastrophe of catastrophes. In the same way that time, like Aristotle said, is the accident of accidents, geographic globalisation is by essence a major catastrophe. Not because of bad capitalists, but because it is the end, the closing of the world on itself through speed, the velocity of images, the rapidity of transportation. We live in a world of forclusion’ (Virilio and Lotringer, 2005: 77) For Virilio the globe we inhabit is actually what he sees as a world closed off and closed in. In Virilio’s self-conscious reflection he has been ‘working for some thirty years’ on this condition, ‘on the shrinking of the world’ that is on what he has called ‘the world’s old age’ (Virilio and Depardon, 2008b: 8).

### Uniqueness--Cap Collapse Coming

#### Banking failures, bailouts, and rises in prices all foretell the end of capitalism

**ETUC 2008**

(European Trade Union Confederation, “The London Declaration: a call for fairness and tough action”, 27th September 2008, <http://www.tuc.org.uk/economy/tuc-15399-f0.cfm>, accessed 7/5/13, JK) The world financial crisis must be a turning point and cause a complete change in the way the financial world works. The dominant model of financial capitalism is close to collapse. This capitalism, liberated from long-standing restraints around 25 years ago, especially in the USA, has been used since as a role model for the rest of the world to follow. It has patronised the many while it exploited them for the benefit of the few, following years of exalting privatisation, deregulation and unfettered markets.¶ Now its excesses have brought it close to ruin - and it threatens the real economy. Indeed Europe's economy lives in fear of being hit by a financial tsunami speeding across the Atlantic despite the relative strength so far of the euro area. The US Government is scrambling together hundreds of billions of dollars to save key banks from their own folly; the credit crunch is strangling finance for industry as banks hoard money to protect themselves. Recession looms.¶ Let us be absolutely clear. This crisis was caused by greed and recklessness in Wall Street, London and other major financial centres. Senior executives permitted speculation on a huge scale on investments they ill understood. Speculators have exacerbated the serious rises in fuel, food and raw materials. The losers are many and include workers in the industry and more generally, pensioners, families, providers and firms seeking investment capital, and all of us as taxpayers bailing out banks. The costs of the American rescue are huge and the commitment of central banks round the world has already been very substantial. It will take years to recover the money, if ever we manage to do so, and our future ability to fund high-quality public services is being placed in jeopardy.¶ That's why this time there must be a turning point. Never again can irresponsibility by banks and hedge funds and the rest be allowed to come close to bankrupting nations. Never again must taxpayers' money be used to prop up institutions that continue to pay huge salaries and bonuses to their top executives. Never again can shareholder value, with directors' bonuses linked to it, be allowed to be the sole goal of companies. We cannot risk a repeat of this gross irresponsibility, greed and negligence

### Uniqueness—Latin America moving to Socialism Now

#### A new socialist bloc is gaining momentum-- Venezuela proves.

Piitso 2013

(Phaste Justice Piitso, former Ambassador to the republic of Cuba, “Once again the Bolivarian Socialist Revolution and the heroic people of the Republic of Venezuela have triumphed over adversity”, May 2nd 2013, <http://www.sacp.org.za/main.php?ID=3965>, accessed 7/5/13, JK)

Once again the Bolivarian socialist revolution and the heroic people of the republic of Venezuela have triumphed over adversity.¶ We take the opportunity to join the progressive movement and the people of the world to congratulate the Bolivarian socialist revolution, the heroic people of the socialist republic of Venezuela and our newly elected President, Cde Nicolas Maduro, for the successful national elections. The results of the elections are a living testimony that the Bolivarian socialist revolution of our America derives its existence from the foundations of our democratic principles. ¶ The momentous victory by the revolutionary forces of Bolivar represents the highest form of expression and appreciation of the leadership of their Commander in Chief and the leader of the revolution Cde President Hugo Chavez. The people of Venezuela have reaffirmed the legacy of the leader of their revolution Hugo Chavez against the wishes and the interests of the US led imperialism. He died for the noble cause of the struggles for the liberation of the working class throughout the world. ¶ The Bolivarian socialist revolution has defeated the most highly sponsored political movement by the US imperialism in the world. Therefore the victory of the popular will of the people of Venezuela is the victory against imperialism and colonialism. The people have defeated a US sponsored counter revolution from the heart of their motherland.¶ The successful victory of the Bolivarian socialist revolution has added the necessary impetus to the working class movement across the world to take forward the momentum of our struggles against the imperialist oppression and exploitation. The triumph of our revolutionary forces is indeed a giant leap forward to our struggles for the liberation of our people in the former colonies and semi colonies. It is indeed a triumph of our revolution against adversity.¶ Our beautiful Bolivarian socialist revolution has indeed proven to the world that in the cause of the revolutionary struggles of the working class, great revolutions always bring great men to the forefront and therefore unearth talents beyond the imagination of man. The US led imperialism has never imagined that a humbled revolution can produce out of an ordinary son of the working class, out of a bus driver, an outstanding and the most revolutionary leader of the calibre of President Nicolas Maduro.¶ It is also worrisome that the US is instigating its garrison of counter revolution to reject the outcomes of such a fair and democratic elections. This attempt to reject legitimate democratic process constitute a major thread to the peace and security of the people of Venezuela and the region. ¶ Imperialism and colonialism is much worried by the success of the struggles of our people in the former colonies and semi colonies. The strength and the organisation of the working class is increasingly shaking the foundations of imperialism. ¶ The US led imperialism will never come to terms that the working class in Venezuela under the leadership of President Maduro is leading the most powerful revolutionary socialist movement of the 21th century at its doorsteps. The Latin American region is becoming the pinnacle of the world wide struggles against imperialism and colonial domination.¶ The heroic people of the Latin America are following the giant footprints of their revolutionary leader and the father of their wars of independence Simon Bolivar. He was a great leader who led relentless struggles for the independence of the whole of latin America against Spanish imperialism and colonialism.¶ The are inspired by the most revolutionary and exemplary leadership of the slave people whose struggles led to the declaration of the first independent slave republic of Haiti.It is inspiring to mention that it was the revolution of Haiti under the leadership of President Alexandre Petion, which assisted Simon Bolivar with the military and financial resources that defeated the Spanish colonialism in the region. ¶ Immediately after the defeat of the US sponsored puppet government through popular elections in 1998, the newly elected President, Cde Hugo Chavez, declared the socialist character of the Bolivarian socialist republic of Venezuela. The reason why this formidable socialist revolution is named after the visionary leader of the struggles of the people of Latin America, Simon Bolivar. ¶ Cde Hugo Chavez was inspired by the heroic struggles of the people of Haiti who declared the first slave independent republic in the history of mankind. He stood to the true traditions that liberated Latin America from Spanish colonialsm.
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### Uniqueness—Latin America moving to Socialism Now
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¶ The Bolivarian Alliance for the people of our America is the first formidable block of emerging countries of the former colonies and semi colonies to have declared the socialist character of their revolution after the collapse of the socialism in the Soviet Union and the communist states of the Eastern Europe. It is a regional organization that has achieved tremendous success to integrate the social, political and the economic terrain of the region based on revolutionary socialist principles.¶ The new struggles to advance a socialist revolution in the Latin America has ushered in a new and unprecedented world political situation in the aftermath of the cold war. It is in this this region where the working class struggles have made decisive advances to conquer state power, liquidate imperialism and at the same time continue to consolidate the victories of their Bolivarian socialist revolution of our 21th century. ¶ The Bolivarian socialist revolution has become the epicenter of struggles against the US led neoliberal economic policies throughout the world. Most of the regional governments have opted for the socialist model of economic ownership through nationalization of the key sectors of their economy. The Bolivarian Alliance for the people of the America is preparing its people to embrace the reconstruction of a new society based on values of socialist democratic principles.¶ Most of the governments in the region are consolidating a regional economic integration model based on the vision of social welfare, bartering and mutual economic aid. They are encouraging a state centered trade model driven by the principle of solidarity instead of the monopolistic US neoliberal framework.¶ The Bolivarian socialist revolution is posing a challenge to the US economic domination in the American hemisphere. The community of over 33 Latin American and Caribbean states has formed a new economic alliance the exclusion of the dominant US empire. The organization of the American states( OAS) is no more a hegemonic power over the complex socio economic relations of the region.¶ The Bolivarian socialist revolution underway in the Latin America is a symbol of hope to the working class movement throughout the world. The prospects and possibilities of a new socialist block after the collapse of the Soviet Union are taking shape in the Latin America. We appreciate this revolutionary offspring of the Cuban revolution. The Bolivarian revolution is a symbol of hope to all humanity.¶

### Uniqueness—Latin America moving to Socialism Now

Chavez’s push to 21st century socialism has moved Venezuela away from consumerism

**Bohmer 2009**

(Peter, Ph. D. in Economics from the University of Massachusetts and was on the Department of Economics at the San Diego State College (Quals from Jstor), “Venezuela: Socialism for the 21st Century”, <http://www.zcommunications.org/venezuela-socialism-for-the-21st-century-by-peter-bohmer>, Augest 3rd 2009, accessed 7/5/13, JK)

A central part of the socialist project in Venezuela is the commitment to developing socialist consciousness among the population. Towards this end, schools and particularly the various education related missions stress the teaching of socialist values such as solidarity, cooperation, self-management, and equality and strongly challenge and criticize individualism, egoism and consumerism. Venezuelan medical students, interning and studying at Barrio Adentro are learning to serve the community and about the right of all to medical care as well as medical skills. Another part of the ongoing cultural revolution is the conscious objective of developing pride and knowledge of Venezuela culture and history, of independence leaders and the history of indigenous people and their struggles for self-determination, and of oppressed people's resistance. In the schools and the mission and in the Ministry of Culture, Venezuelan music and art are fostered and emphasized as are the pluricultural and multiethnic roots and current reality of Venezuela. There is strong government support for the growth of music, films, theater, murals and other forms of art whose roots are Venezuelan. There is a commitment to reclaim Venezuelan culture, to develop Venezuelan media, and to combat the domination by U.S. culture and media. ¶ There is a major campaign carried out by publicly funded or run institutions and by non-publicly supported ones in support of women's equality, for worker's dignity, for equality for indigenous people and against all forms of racial discrimination, for food sovereignty and endogenous development and Venezuelan sovereignty, for sustainable development and for solidarity with oppressed people in all of the Americas and throughout the world. For example, we saw much support for the Palestinian struggle.¶ Chávez is continually stressing the necessity of transforming values for there to be socialism. Socialism requires both the change in values as well as the transformation of economic and political institutions. There is a danger that words such as socialism and solidarity will become merely rhetoric and hollow unless the economic and political institutions are simultaneously being transformed so that these socialist values are fostered and encouraged and can be practiced. If business enterprises, private or state owned, continue to be hierarchically run while Chávez talks on TV about self-management, cynicism about socialism will be the result. ¶ Political Transformation Participatory democracy is often used as a synonym for socialism in Venezuela. Its concept of democracy is far more than voting for candidates of one's choice in free elections and the guaranteeing of basic civil liberties such as freedom of the press, religion, freedom of speech and expression, rights to a fair trial, right to privacy, etc. Participatory democracy means that people should be directly involved in making decisions that affect them, e.g., deciding how government budgets be spent. ¶ Another integrally related concept is popular power. The growth of popular power, particularly at the local level is involving large numbers of people, in the millions, in deciding how to develop and run their communities thorough the institution of the communal council is an example of participatory democracy and growing popular power. It is exciting to observe the involvement of people formerly excluded from the political process making decisions about their communities, e.g., who needs housing the most, how to build housing, community priorities, etc. As with many of these institutional changes in ¶ Venezuela, e.g., the communal councils, how widespread they are and will become and what are the limits of their power is not yet determined. Moreover, the communal councils because of their very local orientation—they consist of no more than 400 households, usually less-- are not equipped to make decisions that involve large geographical areas and more people. A new and developing institution of popular power is the comuna or commune. In the comuna, a few communal councils join together to make decisions that affect this larger area and population. In the State of Lara, a comuna decided to build a milk plant whose employees come from a number of adjacent communities and whose milk is distributed among the residents of the comuna. The comuna also will decide how to distribute the surplus.[xiii] Also significant is the growth in ¶ Venezuela of social movements such as environmental, peasant, women's, indigenous and community media. They are part of the emerging popular power in Venezuela. Many of these social movements are autonomous from the state, from Chávez and from the United Socialist Party of Venezuela, the PSUV, which was formed in January, 2007, is led by Chávez and is the major political party in Venezuela today. Economic Transformation Today, the economy of Venezuela is still a capitalist dominated economy although definitely not a neo-liberal one. Let us conceptualize the economy as being divided into three different types of production and social relations, the private, state and social economy sector. The largest is the private sector, meaning that it is primarily organized with the goal of maximizing profits and that the capital--money, structures, equipment and inventory--are privately owned.

### Uniqueness—Latin America moving to Socialism Now

#### Venezuela has started an anti-capitalist campaign that is already gaining traction even in the US,

**Bohmer 2009**

(Peter, Ph. D. in Economics from the University of Massachusetts and was on the Department of Economics at the San Diego State College (Quals from Jstor), “Venezuela: Socialism for the 21st Century”, <http://www.zcommunications.org/venezuela-socialism-for-the-21st-century-by-peter-bohmer>, Augest 3rd 2009, accessed 7/5/13, JK)

By the early 1990's, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of Soviet Union, and the defeat of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, signaled to many the end of socialism. So did the movement by formerly non-capitalist nations such as Vietnam and especially China towards a private enterprise led production for profit capitalist system. The severe economic difficulties of Cuba was considered as further evidence that the period of alternatives to capitalism was coming to an end. This led to the "end of history" claims that liberal capitalism was the economic system that the entire world was evolving towards and would not evolve beyond, and that the time for socialism had passed and that it was not a desirable model. ¶ In 1998, Hugo Chávez was elected President of Venezuela. He spoke strongly and acted against savage neoliberalism in his electoral campaign and after taking power but socialism was not a part of his vocabulary or program for his first few years in office. Since late 2004, he has been increasingly calling for Socialism for the 21st Century in Venezuela, and speaking out against capitalism and imperialism. ¶ This call for 21st century socialism has resonated throughout the Americas, although a little more slowly in the U.S. than in other places. Even here in the U.S., there is increased interest in and decreased hostility towards socialism.[[i]](http://www.zcommunications.org/FCKeditor26/editor/fckeditor.html?InstanceName=body&Toolbar=Default" \l "_edn1" \o "_ednref1) ¶ I will share some of my understanding of the present and possible future of Venezuela so that we can effectively counter the criticisms we hear of it by our politicians and media.. Another reason to study the Venezuela process is so that we can dream about and learn lessons for organizing and advocating for socialism in the 21st century in the U.S., a country that today is more unequal in its income distribution than Venezuela. [[ii]](http://www.zcommunications.org/FCKeditor26/editor/fckeditor.html?InstanceName=body&Toolbar=Default" \l "_edn2" \o "_ednref2) Venezuela is not socialist but rather Chávez and others calling for 21st century socialism are placing Venezuela in that tradition while calling for something different and new and culturally appropriate and historically specific for Venezuela. In this paper, I will also briefly examine the Venezuelan economy today. ¶

### Alternative—New Politics

Reject the aff, thus creating space and allowing for the germination of alternative politics

**Aparicio and Blaser ’08** (Juan Ricardo Aparicio, Associate Professor of Languages and Sociocultural Studies at the University of the Andes, Phd. In Anthropology from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Mario Blaser, professor of Anthropology at University of California, Davis, “The ‘Lettered City’ and the Insurrection of Subjugated Knowledges in Latin America, Anthropological Quarterly, Vol. 81, No. 1 (Winter ’08), JSTOR http://www.jstor.org/stable/30052740 SM)

**The rejection of the modern state and capitalist market as organizing vectors of social life also expresses a rejection of representation as the overarching logic for politics**. In effect, as Zibechi (2005) argues, **the legitimacy of the state rests on the claim of being the ultimate representation and suture of a fragmented social body**. Thus, **representation "operates in the absence of social ties." Similarly, the legitimacy claimed for the capitalist market by neoliberal ideologues** like Hayek (1973) **is that, through pricing, it provides the perfect representational mechanism to sort out the competing interests of individuals**. Closely related to these conceptions of the political is **the idea that the necessary dispersion produced by the inherent diversity of perspectives in human society can be overcome by appealing to a supposedly unified reality**. Here is where modern politics also functions as a politics of truth. In effect, although not in theory, **the claim that the state or the market constitutes the suture of a fragmented society is related to a claim that they operate on the basis of true knowledge produced by expert institutions, that is, that their actions respond to an accurate representation of a single and undisputable reality which of necessity overcomes differences**. **By contrast, the presence of strong social ties, forged through communal life within the territory, provides an alternative vector through which the social can be realized**. For example, the former Bolivian minister of education and Indigenous intellectual Felix Patzi sees in **the communal system, which still constitutes the basis of Aymaras' and Quechuas' ayllu economies, a basis for the construction of present-day alternatives to the neoliberal system, and to modern politics in general**. A central characteristic of the communal system is that it tends to avoid concentration of power or the emergence of a power that can position itself in a relation of exteriority to the community (Patzi 2004:181).s Thus, even though the communal system does not imply a complete lack of hierarchies and internal stratification, it can nevertheless be contrasted with the state-form associated with modern politics. For instance, **while modern politics addresses the internal differences of society through overarching institutions that are based on the principle of representation and stand as an external power to the society they govern, communal politics addresses differences through institutions that are based on the principle of relationality** and operate by delegating tasks rather than power (see Patzi 2004; Zibechi 2006). Moreton-Robinson explains that in Indigenous cultural domains **"relationality means that one experiences the self as part of others and that others are part of the self"** (2000:16). When political, economic and intellectual institutions such as communal assemblies, communal labor, communal rituals, and the delegation of tasks embody this principle, **they tend to operate by ceaselessly co-adjusting internal differences through consensus which can then be translated into directives given to delegates that "command by obeying" the assemblies**. In this way **the separation between society and its political, economic, and intellectual "organs" is forestalled**. This is precisely what the communal system and the insurrectional patterns of mobilization share in common. The effort to sustain and/or generate institutions that foster communal bonds and avert the emergence of powers exterior to the community, all the while attending to everyday needs, is evident in a variety of settings including the Zapatistas' autonomous Mayan communities in Chiapas, Mexico (Earle and Simonelli 2005; Stahler-Sholk 2007); the recovered factories and neighborhood organizations of unemployed workers in Argentina (Fernandez 2006; Neuhaus and Calello 2006); many of the rural and urban grassroots organizations that supported the coming to power of Evo Morales in Bolivia (Mamani Ramirez 2005; Zibechi 2006); and Black communities in the Colombian pacific region (Escobar In Press), to mention a few. In a way, we can say that what **the insurrectional patterns of mobilization are doing in these settings is to produce and strengthen communities by performing the principles of the communal system as best as they can.**

### Alternative-- Storytelling

**The core of capitalism is the private sphere of labor. It is where laborers are produced. The labor of a housewife is unpaid and never-ending. What is required for the rupture of capitalism is a set aside time for establishing solidarity and telling the stories of marginalized Latin American women.**

**Motta ’13** (Sara C., Senior lecturer in politics at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “’We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For’ The Feminization of Resistance in Venezuela,” Latin American Perspectives, SagePub, 07/04/13, <http://lap.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/04/19/0094582X13485706>, SM)

Conceptually **this work proceeded through a critique of the orthodox Marxist claim that the capitalist family does not produce for capitalism and is therefore** not value producing, thus framing women’s struggles as **secondary** (linked to oppression and not exploitation) **to anticapitalist struggles in the workplace** (see Dalla Costa and James, 1975: 10–11). Autonomist Marxist **feminists argue that the family** and community **produce value through the unpaid labor of the housewife, the commodity produced being the laborer himself.** As Dalla Costa and James (1975: 5) explain,¶ This is a strange commodity for it is not a thing. **The ability to labor resides only in a human being, whose life is consumed in the process of producing.** First it must be **nine months in the womb, must be fed, clothed and trained, then when it works its bed must be made, its floor swept, its lunchbox pre- pared, its sexuality not gratified but quietened, its dinner ready. . . . This is how labour power is produced and reproduced. . . . To describe its basic production and reproduction is to describe women’s work.**¶ The labor of social reproduction, they argue, is qualitatively distinct from that of waged labor not only because **it is invisible and unwaged** but because it is premised upon the **isolated labor of the home, which is never-ending**. “To the extent that [the woman] must in isolation procreate, raise and be responsible for children . . **. she is always on duty, for the machine doesn’t exist that makes and minds children**” (Dalla Costa and James, 1975: 12). The community and the family therefore become the other half of capitalist organization, the hidden source of surplus value, through their role in producing the laborer. Different aspects of social reproduction such as **health, education, housing, child care, sexuality, fertility, and the family are all relationships that make possible the reproduction of the laborer and. therefore the reproduction of the capital relation**. The private and **the personal thus become power-ridden and political**.5 Accordingly**, they are also key axes of women’s struggle** that can disrupt the smooth flow of capitalist reproduction. **Central to that struggle is breaking out of the social isolation of the labor of social reproduction**, developing demands that enable the **freeing up of time for women’s struggle and the formation of solidarities among women and between women and men** (Dalla Costa and James, 1975: 21–24).¶ At the same time, these scholar-activists developed alternative historiographies from below of poor women’s experiences and struggles that revealed primitive accumulation to be the creation of a particular sexual and gendered division of labor. This division is constructed around binary gendered relations of men and women, with the former concentrated in production (public sphere) and the latter in social production (private sphere) (Federici, 2004). These historiographies have demonstrated that over the “last four or five centuries, women . . . were externalized, declared to be outside civilized society, pushed down and thus made the invisible as the under-water part of an iceberg is invisible, yet constitute the basis of the whole” (Mies, 1986: 77).¶ Thus **autonomist Marxist feminism enables us to perceive a multiplicity of axes of domination but also potential axes of resistance through its conceptualization of the web of relations between men and women**, masculine and feminine, mind and body, private and public, and production and reproduction that are constitutive of capitalist social relationships. As Fisher-Hoffman (2008: 12) explains, “from a theoretical perspective, this implies that women experience capitalist relations in distinct ways from men; and on a practical level this carries implications for women’s movements and class struggle.”¶ **This framework suggests the need for concrete historicized analysis of women’s struggles that looks to poor women’s experience and histories of struggle as an avenue for exploring the gendered and classed social relations of domination and resistance. This is particularly salient in the Venezuelan context, where histories of popular struggle have been marginal and histories of poor women’s struggles, lives, and experiences even more so** (Huggins Castañeda, 2010: 182–187; Tovar Nuñez, 2010: 11–24; Vargas Arenas, 2010: 43–44). When women have been written about they have been individual elite women linked to powerful men. Illustrative of the continuity of this gendered historiography in Chavismo is the focus on great (mostly male) leaders in the official revolutionary historiography (Vargas Arenas, 2010: 58).¶ Methodologically, epistemologically, and politically, therefore, this analysis is anchored in the experiences of three women protagonists in the struggle for social justice and democracy in La Vega. Here “personal” should not be equated with “individualized,” the personal being a site through which the social relations of capitalism are embodied. Therefore the **analysis of** these **individuals’ experiences provides keys to understanding the potential, limitations, and complexity of their role in social reproduction and transformation.**

### Alternative S-- Storytelling

**This story of Isaura highlights the severing effects of neoliberalism, but also indicates the power of women in resistance.**

**Motta ’13** (Sara C., Senior lecturer in politics at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “’We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For’ The Feminization of Resistance in Venezuela,” Latin American Perspectives, SagePub, 07/04/13, <http://lap.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/04/19/0094582X13485706>, SM)

**Isaura began her life in a middle-class family but fell in love with one of her father’s workers and was forced to leave her family home. She arrived in La Vega in the late 1950**s and along with other new arrivals helped found the barrio La Independencia, where she still lives. **As she recounted, “I remember when this was just rubble, old cars, shacks with no floors or bathrooms, roads that were dirt. We built our own house gradually, the first floor where we began, and now we have three floors, as you can see. It was like that for all of us.” She began community work in a context of an informal settlement in which basic services were not provided by the state**. Sometimes this involved providing a shoulder to cry on for a neighbor, sometimes looking after the children of one of the many single mothers in her barrio, and sometimes organizing the community to fight for health services and water: **“I have always been involved with community work. For me it is my life, of course, along with my children and family. Always, 30 years of being a housewife and a community worker. We have blocked roads, taken over the bank and the offices of the municipality.”** Her experiences reflect the exclusion of the urban poor from the Punto Fijo pact but also the territorialized and often feminized solidarities that were built into everyday life.¶ **As conditions worsened following the economic decline and the beginnings of neoliberal reform in the late 1980s, the cost of food rose and unemployment increased. Under these conditions men reproduced machista characteristics while women often took on the role of ensuring their families’ and communities’ survival: “There are always those [men] on the streets, drinking and playing billiards, but there were more, so many young men and their fathers without work, with nothing to do but drink and waste their time with women, gambling.”** Of the Caracazo Isaura remembers the chaos and the deaths, sons of her friends shot, the army and police invasion. Yet she also recalls the continuing community unity as families, particularly women, helped each other to ensure that neighbors didn’t go without food, “We cooked sancocho [chicken stew] in a huge pot in the middle of the street. The young ones put on music. We tried to keep our community together.”¶ Isaura’s experiences include the solidarities and sociabilities formed through the construction of the physical space of La Vega in the 1950s and the defense of these communities through cultural and political work in the 1990s. These collective struggles were constituted against the gendered and classed exclusions of the Punto Fijo system, but they also mirrored these gendered divisions of labor, with **women playing the often invisible and devalued role of caregivers and nurturers. Particularly noticeable, however, was the role of women at the heart of community resilience and resistance** (see also Ontiveros, 2008; Ramírez, 2007).¶

### Alternative S-- Storytelling

**The feminization of resistance currently occurring in Venezuela must be acknowledged by academia through a process of border thinking. Interaction between the critical debate epistemology and the epistemologies of women on the margins of Latin America ruptures patriarchal capitalism. The intersection of public and private in a Latino American woman creates a critical opportunity for the deconstruction of patriarchy and capitalism.**

**Motta ’13** (Sara C., Senior lecturer in politics at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “’We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For’ The Feminization of Resistance in Venezuela,” Latin American Perspectives, SagePub, 07/04/13, <http://lap.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/04/19/0094582X13485706>, SM)

While there has been a feminization of poverty, **there is** also **a feminization of resistance that is reconfiguring and reimagining the nature, meaning, and subjects of political resistance and social transformation. This is notably the case in Venezuela, where women are numerically a majority of the social support base of Chavismo** and where the political conjuncture has created **possibilities for the development of new forms of revolutionary subjectivity** (Fernandes, 2010; Motta, 2011a; Rantala, 2009). **Yet such dynamics and struggles are on the margins of scholarly and political analysis. Without an analytic and theoretical engagement with these dynamics we run the risk of producing academic theory that reproduces the historical masking and delegitimization of women’s role at the heart of revolutionary and popular struggle** (Dalla Costa and James, 1975: 13). The autonomous Marxist feminist framework for analyzing women’s strug- gles in Venezuela that I develop here emerged from women’s struggles in the periphery of Europe—in Italy—in the 1970s and spoke to the increasing politi- cization of social reproduction. These struggles reflected a discomfort with and often a rejection of a politics of representation and a praxis of revolutionary feminism that focused on the dominant script of politics. While the women whose lives and struggles are shared here do not explicitly identify themselves as feminists, often because Venezuelan feminists have traditionally reflected bourgeois liberal frames of feminism that discount questions of race and class (Fisher-Hoffman, 2008: 24–38), much of their praxis shares the concerns and themes of autonomous Marxist feminism.¶ My analysis builds upon the concrete synergies between autonomist Marxist feminism and contemporary Venezuelan women’s and feminist politics. One of the most notable is the dialogue between Global Women’s Strike and Venezuelan Socialist feminists such as Nora Castañeda, head of the Women’s Development Bank. This dialogue has nurtured a feminist struggle that has contributed to, for example, the inclusion in the 1999 Bolivarian Constitution of Article 88, which recognizes housework as producing social benefits and economic value, and the development of Misión Madres del Barrio and the Women’s Development Bank (see Alva and Castañeda, 2009: 119–132; Fisher- Hoffman, 2008: 24–38). The **engagement between autonomist feminist Marxism and women’s struggles in contemporary Venezuela is framed by border thinking** (see Anzaldúa, 1987; Mignolo, 2000). **Border thinking seeks to break down conceptual and theoretical categories of knowledge by speaking from the epistemological margins of modernity**, be they within the margins of the West or on its margins in the global South. **It encourages dialogue between and within places but also reminds us to take seriously the place of enunciation of a theory/concept**—the position **in relation to capitalism** and colonialism **that determines who can speak, how one can speak, and what is heard and how** (in terms of the subjects and nature of knowledge and the possibilities and limits of social transformation).1 **Women’s struggles in** Italy and **Venezuela come from the underside of patriarchal capitalism**. They are the voices of those **excluded and delegitimized by the universalizing and violent power dynamics of patriarchal colonial capitalism**. The places of enunciation of their theories are similar in that they speak against marginalization and delegitimization but different in that they speak from different places on the margins: one from the margins of the center and the other from the margins on the periphery. This suggests the **possibility of dialogical translations between the locally embedded epistemologies of women on the margins in Latin America and** the **critical epistemologies** that emerge from within the margins of Europe. This dialogue does not ignore differences in context or fall into the trap of hegemonic feminist representations of “poor” Third World women that overlook the concrete agency and experience of those subjects (Mohanty, 2003; Spivak, 1988).¶ This particular analysis is part of a broader project of dialogical decolonizing research (for Venezuelan feminist conceptualizations of such a project, see Espinosa Miñoso, 2009, and Celiberti, 2009).

(Continued –No text deleted)

### Alternative S—Storytelling

(Continued –No text deleted)

**As a mestiza single-mother feminist researcher, I also exist on the margins of the academy and of society. I write from a reality of marginality as an outsider/insider within the academy and an insider/outsider within movements such as Venezuela’s urban land committees and other feminist autonomist movements in the UK and Colombia.** My praxis of border thinking occurs in the messy spaces in which bodies connect, engage, and develop alternative logics of being, creating, loving, and thinking otherwise.¶ My work with the urban land committees has involved a popular educational pedagogical praxis collectively constructed in a series of workshops designed to forge translations between their experiences and experiences of collective struggle in Europe and other parts of Latin America. It has also involved the development of textual work that reads the practices and critical theories of open Marxism and post-left anarchy produced in the margins of the West from the practical theories of the urban land committees in search of resonances and dissonances that may help develop the objectives and strategies of both (see Motta, 2012, for an example of such border thinking in textual form). Additionally, it has involved sharing the experiences and theories of urban land committee women with feminist groups and collectives in which I participate in the UK and Colombia. This **translation between intensely locally embedded epistemologies** (and their logics) **on the margins of Latin America and Europe transforms both**. I hope that it will help **create a plurality of forms of knowing that ruptures the epistemological politics of patriarchal capitalist coloniality.** I offer it as a fragment, to be read, reread, critiqued, taken apart, and put back together in a multiplicity of ways in which the process of review can itself be read as an element of this rereading and critique.4 As Lillian Suárez Navaz (quoted in Celiberti, 2009: 82) argues, “Decolonization implies working in hybrid alliances—multiclass, transnational—to **foster a transformative feminist movement that can counteract with organization, solidarity, and strength the dramatic effect of neoliberal capitalism on the lives of women**.” Autonomous Marxist feminist analysis, developed by Federici (2004), Mies (1986), and Dalla Costa and James (1975) and built on in the contemporary Venezuelan context by Fisher-Hoffman (2008), examines the link between patriarchy and capitalism. As Mies (1986: 38) argues, the “goal of this system, namely **the never-ending process of capital accumulation, cannot be achieved unless patriarchal man-woman relations are maintained or newly created. Patriarchy constitutes the invisible underground of the visible capitalist system.**” These theorists argue that **a critique of capitalist political economy** and revolutionary and autonomous women’s struggle **requires beginning with the female experience** (Dalla Costa and James, 1975: 5). In their struggle to call attention to and build women’s social power and autonomy during the feminist struggles of the 1970s, autonomist Marxist feminists produced a theory of the productivity of labor that pointed to **women’s labor in the private sphere of the family and community and a historiography from below of primitive accumulation that demonstrated the construction of gendered subjectivities based upon a sexual division of labor articulated through the state and social institutions, most notably the nuclear family.**

### Alternative S—Storytelling

**We need to utilize spaces creating a new space for women’s’ political resistance**

**Motta ’13** (Sara C., Senior lecturer in politics at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “’We Are the Ones We Have Been Waiting For’ The Feminization of Resistance in Venezuela,” Latin American Perspectives, SagePub, 07/04/13, <http://lap.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/04/19/0094582X13485706>, SM)

**Neoliberalism has led to a feminization of poverty, responsibility, and obligation** both globally and **in Latin America**, and this has coincided with a crisis in masculinized organized labor (see Chant, 2008; Hite and Viterna, 2005). There has been **a surge in female participation in the workforce caused by neoliberal economic restructuring and mediated by assaults on the rights and guarantees won by organized labor in previous decades** (see, e.g., Chant, 2008; Ehrenreich and Hochschild, 2004; Gideon, 2007; Hite and Viterna, 2005). Often **subject to unregulated and precarious working conditions, women also continue to undertake the majority of domestic labor** (González de la Rocha, 2001; Olivera, 2006). Thus the decline in masculinized formal labor has been replaced not by a more egalitarian division of labor in the home but by an **intensification of women’s financial and emotional responsibilities and obligations**. Arguably, **women’s inclusion in the workforce is part of a political project of restructuring capitalism involving the disciplining and division of popular struggles** of the 1970s (including feminist struggles) and the **breaking of the social and political power of women** (Midnight Notes Collective, 1992:¶ 320–321).¶ Many of these analyses also point to the contradictory consequences of neo-liberalism for women’s lives and the possibilities of women’s resistance (see esp. Hite and Viterna, 2005; Cupples, 2005; Talcott, 2004; Tinsman, 2000). Much of this work focuses on everyday interactions and relationships, pointing out that the **increasing proportion of informalized labor** combined with the break- down of the survival mechanisms of the working and informalized poor have unintended consequences. One is that the place of **popular struggle has shifted from the formal world of work to the community. Because women are at the heart of the community, they become central actors** in these new forms of popular politics (see Motta et al., 2011, for comparative analysis, and, for Venezuela, Fernandes, 2007 and 2010; Fisher-Hoffman, 2008; Rantala, 2009). Mothers, families, and communities have sought individual and collective ways to survive on the margins of the money economy (Federici, 1992; Hite and Viterna, 2005).¶ Feminist analyses therefore point to the **possibilities of resistance that are created by the contradictory realities of neoliberalism, forms of resistance that are increasingly territorialized and feminized. This resistance challenges traditional Western political thought, which rests on a conceptualization of the political that excludes women and all that is represented by femininity and women’s bodies** (Brown, 1988; Sargisson, 1996). These analyses demonstrate that a rearticulation of women’s politics is occurring in the everyday, the private, and the informalized world of work. They suggest a stretching of traditional conceptualizations of the site of political struggle away from the point of production toward the traditional script of political parties, unions, and the state (Cupples, 2005; Talcott, 2004; Tinsman, 2000).¶ While there has been a feminization of poverty, there is also a **feminization of resistance that is reconfiguring and reimagining the nature, meaning, and subjects of political resistance and social transformation. This is notably the case in Venezuela, where women are numerically a majority of the social sup- port base of Chavismo** and where the political conjuncture has created **possibilities for the development of new forms of revolutionary subjectivity** (Fernandes, 2010; Motta, 2011a; Rantala, 2009). **Yet such dynamics and struggles are on the margins of scholarly and political analysis. Without an analytic and theoretical engagement with these dynamics we run the risk of producing academic theory that reproduces the historical masking and delegitimization of women’s role at the heart of revolutionary and popular struggle** (Dalla Costa and James, 1975: 13).

### AT: Green Capitalism

#### Green capitalism is a myth, created so that we can ignore the damage we do to the environment, and feel better about our practices. Environmental destruction is part of capitalism’s nature, and it will inevitably do so.

**James 2012**

(Jennifer C., Associate Professor of English and the Director of the Africana Studies Program at The George Washington University, “Burried in Guana: Race, Labor, and Sustainability”, Project Muse, Spring 2012, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_literary_history/v024/24.1.james.html#back>, accessed 7/5/13, JK)

Eco-materialists have long held that many for-profit businesses manufacturing "sustainable" products, such as "green" paper products, or claiming "sustainable" practices intentionally encourage unnecessary and destructive consumption. Marxist literary critic Leerom Medovoi maintains that while random acts of "sustainable capitalism" might satisfy consumers' desire to be good environmental citizens, sustainability and capitalism remain fundamentally irreconcilable. Noting the title of Shell Oil's 2001 handbook "people, planet, profit" as a particularly egregious instance in which a corporation has appropriated green discourse [End Page 117] to prolong its environmental recklessness he worries that eco-consumerism of any stripe may "substitute for some more profound ethical critique . . . and political transformation" (132). Retooling Freudian disavowal, the psychic splitting which occurs when humans turn away from those disturbing "facts" about ourselves that we have glimpsed but cannot face, Medovoi finds our relationship to sustainable capitalism equally defensive. The only way we can imagine a healthy planetary future with capitalism is if we willfully deny its "second contradiction": its irrational tendency to harm the environments on which its own survival depends.[2](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_literary_history/v024/24.1.james.html" \l "f2) This is where the disavowed "dark subtext" of sustainability threatens to surface (131). "To sustain" can also mean to be the recipient of injury, as when one "sustains" a wound (131). But sustaining a wound is not the same as succumbing to one; it connotes that the harmed has endured the injury for a period of time and has survived it. As Medovoi explains capitalism has no intention of wantonly killing us all, as other decriers of neoliberalism might believe. More efficiently, it "seeks to gauge the kind and amount of life that must not be killed now so that . . . extraction can continue indefinitely into the future" (142). It needs us—at least some of us—to "tolerate" the escalating injury it will inflict as it continues to sustain itself (142). Thus, the very discourse of "sustainability," with its disavowed subtext always trying to emerge, comes uncannily close to revealing capitalism's own disavowal: it damages and then endeavors to cover that damage by marketing us a solution.

### AT: Utilitarianism

The instinct of survival in a capitalist society is used as a tool to commodify experiences of danger to justify endless surveillance and war

**Eagles 2012**

(Julian Eagles, Phd from London School of Economics, “Guy Debord and the Integrated Spectacle”, <http://www.fastcapitalism.com>, Fast Capitalism, 9/1/13, accessed 7/5/13, JK)

So there is, in part, a conspiratorial element to the functioning of the integrated spectacle.[[23]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn23) As Debord writes:¶ [Specialists in surveillance] can now employ traditional methods for operations in clandestine milieux: provocation, infiltration, and various forms of elimination of authentic critique in favour of a false one which will have been created for this purpose (1990: 53-4).¶ Indeed, in its quest to crush dissent ‘the highest ambition of the integrated spectacle is still to turn secret agents into revolutionaries, and revolutionaries into secret agents’ (Debord 1990: 11). Take the case of the undercover policeman Mark Kennedy. From 2003 to 2010, Kennedy, a British policeman under the alias Mark Stone, infiltrated various anti-capitalist groups across Europe associated with the ‘anti-globalization’ movement. He was unmasked as a police agent just before a trial was due to begin in which the state sought to prosecute a group of protestors with whom Kennedy was associated; they were accused of planning an occupation of Ratcliffe power station in the UK.[[24]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn24) The conspiratorial side to the spectacle (of which Debord speaks), should not, however, be seen as something unified and omnipotent. Rather, ‘thousands of plots in favour of the established order tangle and clash almost everywhere’ (1990: 82). ‘Surveillance’, Debord suggests, ‘spies on itself, and plots against itself’ (1990: 84). ¶ Debord also alludes, arguably, to the idea that frightening or alarming images, circulated by the mass media, manipulate the individual’s instinct of self-preservation and make him or her experience fear. As he writes: ¶ The spectacle makes no secret of the fact that certain dangers surround the wonderful order it has established. Ocean pollution and the destruction of equatorial forests threaten oxygen renewal; the earth’s ozone layer is menaced by industrial growth; nuclear radiation accumulates irreversibly. It merely concludes that none of these things matter (Debord 1990: 34).[[25]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn25) ¶ It would appear, then, that the mass media – and I think Debord’s use of the term ‘spectacle’ here does denote the mass media – on the one hand generate fear by highlighting specific dangers that pose a threat to the individual’s very existence; and yet on the other hand soothe these fears by suggesting the insignificance of such ‘dangers’.[[26]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn26) On my reading, it is through the media raising the issue of catastrophic dangers to humankind, that the individual’s instinctual impulse of self-preservation is stimulated such that he or she experiences a feeling of extreme fear. In turn, as the spectacle portrays these dangers or risks as unimportant, the individual is relieved of the pain or unpleasure generated by a rise in instinctual tension.¶ This argument could, I think, be applied to the US government’s ‘war on terror’; a ‘war’ launched following the September 11, 2001 attacks in the USA. Periodically, the media raise the issue of new terror plots; this makes the individual feel extremely anxious that his or her existence is threatened by upcoming acts of terror. As the terror attacks fail to materialize, the media subsequently suggesting the insignificance of this particular threat or danger, the individual experiences a feeling of relief. For example, in July 2002 a warning by the state authorities that the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco was a possible target of a terrorist plot (although no such attack subsequently took place), gained widespread media coverage.[[27]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn27) Further, it could be argued that when, occasionally, terror attacks do actually take place, the individual’s feelings of extreme anxiety are soothed as the media report that the state authorities are hunting those responsible for such attacks. For instance, the much publicized US drone aircraft missile attacks which assassinate ‘suspected militants’,[[28]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn28) or the use of special forces to assassinate Islamist militants, such as Osama Bin Laden, who, on 2 May 2011, was killed by a US Naval Seals unit in Abbottabad,
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Pakistan.[[29]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn29)¶ At this point it is pertinent to note that Debord points to the ‘dissolution of logic’ in spectacular society (1990: 27); or put another way, to the rise within the conditions of modern capitalist society, of a technological rationality which appears as reason itself.[[30]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn30) In this connection, the Situationists referred to the spectacle’s power of recuperation; that is to say, modern capitalism’s ability to absorb – via the process of commodification – that which emerges outside of its domain. As Debord writes, ‘[spectacular discourse] isolates all it shows from its context, its past, its intentions and its consequences’ (1990: 28). In other words, anything that becomes subject to the rule of the commodity-form becomes equivalent and its importance or otherwise is veiled.[[31]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn31) It is the logic of the commodity form, then, and not some conspiracy or dictatorship, which has facilitated the emergence of the media’s illogical language. As the commodity form has impacted itself upon images and information, these things have become increasingly fragmented; indeed, separated from their context, past and so on, to such a degree that most people are unable to make any real sense of them. Therefore, in a society in which the commodity-form rules over lived experience, most people lack ‘the ability immediately to perceive what is significant and what is insignificant or irrelevant’ (1990: 30).[[32]](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/9_1/eagles9_1.html" \l "_edn32)

### Aff Answers-Ethics

Capitalism is an amoral system that isn’t bad, but people can be. Blaming “capitalism” instead of actors makes it impossible to check oppression.

Poole 05

Eve Poole “On the Use of Language in the Anti-Capitalist Debate” Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Jul., 2005), pp. 319-325 Springer Accessed 09/07/2013 EJS [Poole lectures in leadership at Ashridge Business School, following earlier careers working for the Church Commissioners and Deloitte Consulting. She teaches strategic and personal leadership, change, consulting skills, and strategic human resource management. Her research interests include ethics, emotional intelligence and models of organizational spirituality. She holds an honors degree in Theology from the University of Durham and an MBA from the University of Edinburgh. She is currently studying part-time with Cambridge University for a PhD in capitalism and theology.]

**Anti-capitalist debate has traditionally drawn up battle lines between oppressed individuals** on the one hand, **and an oppressive system** on the other. While **this** has high rhetorical value, it **is based on imprecise use of language.** **The language confuses an amoral system with immoral agents but at the same time uses anthropomorphic language to lend capitalism moral agency.** **This** inevitably **leads to a confused debate**. Given that all opponents of capitalism want the reformation of what they see as a flawed system, p**recision in the use of the language employed would move the debate into arenas of action, and thus the debate is more likely to generate change**. It is curious that Daniel Bell's defiantly-named Liberation Theology After The End Of History ? The Refusal To Cease Suffering has an entry in its index for "capitalism", but not one for "capitalists". On the other hand, throughout his book he refers to "liberationists", establishing battle lines between "liberationists" on the one hand and "capitalism" on the other. Where he does vary his terminology, seemingly only for effect, he tends to refer to "the capitalist order" or "discipline": again the club and not the members.1 While it may be disingenuous to argue semantics over what remains a robustly argued book, this observation resonates with the general position taken in the modern anti-capitalist debate: **both sides tend to discuss capitalism, but pay little attention to the role of capitalist,** exercising a working assumption that the two terms are linguistically interchangeable. Furthermore, "capitalism" does not appear on its own in Bell's index: its entry reads "capitalism, savage", which, apart from revealing his thesis, highlights a common tendency to take this logical confusion to its natural conclusion by anthropomorphizing the system as a whole. This paper will examine this linguistic confusion, with particular reference to theological writers, and discuss what effect it has on the debate, before offering a perspective on how precision in the language employed will help to clarify the fundamental issues at stake. It will show how the **rhetoric employed in the debate creates a false relationship between the protagonists, by setting individuals against a system**, **then by conferring upon this system anthropomorphic characteristics, thereby creating a chimera and robbing the debate of its ability to effect real change**.

### Aff Answers-Ethics

**The first financial crisis in almost a century was caused by slow reactions. No proof of purposefully unethical actors**

**Niskanen 09**

William A. Niskanen, Senior Economist and Chairman Emeritus of the Cato Institute. “The Undemanding Ethics of Capitalism” *Cato Journal,* Vol. 29, No. 3 (Fall 2009). Cato Institute. < http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2009/11/cj29n3-10.pdf> Accessed 7-9-13 EJS

**The United States and many other countries are now experiencing the first major financial crisis in over 75 years, a condition that too many people have been quick to blame on an outbreak of greed that they claim is characteristic of capitalism.** **Blaming a financial crisis on greed, however, is like blaming airplane crashes on gravity. Greed and gravity are always with us, and capitalist markets usually channel self-interest into mutually beneficial behavior.** **On occasion**, the public and private **institutions that have the responsibility to monitor economic behavior fail** to perform their roles before there are large losses to other parties. **The Securities and Exchange Commission, for example, was slow to react to early information about the misleading accounting by** the **Enron** Corporation and the massive Ponzi scheme by Bernard Madoff, **and the private credit rating agencies are often among the last to recognize that they have substantially underestimated the risks of some securities**. **The current financial crisis, however, is primarily a consequence of public policies to promote home ownership** that have long been supported by politicians of both parties combined with recent changes in the private market for mortgages, **policies and market institutions that have led to massively unwise behavior but with little evidence of a knowing unethical exploitation of other people**.

### Aff Answers-Ethics

**The profit motive is not inherently bad--corporations can be motivated to invest in social causes to bring an end to a laundry list of issues.**

**Husted and Allen 2k**

Bryan W. Husted and David B. Allen” Is It Ethical to Use Ethics as Strategy?” Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 27, No. 1/2, Sep., 2000 , Jstor Accessed 7-9-13 EJS

**As companies become involved in social problems, they begin to make decisions that may not be in the best interests of society as a whole**. **Only freely elected representatives should be involved in decisions that affect the public interest**. F**or example, in many countries corpo rate philanthropy is tax deductible.** Instead of directing resources to areas that will most benefit the public good through government, tax-deductible philanthropy allows the firm to decide where to direct those resources in terms of its own interests. **Yet the involvement of firms in social projects does not leave the government without means to influence the direction of private investments to serve the public interest**. Fiscal **policy can still be used to motivate corporate social investments in areas that are particularly important to a nation - drug abuse, racism, poverty, support for the arts,** etc. **Elected leaders can provide the signals for the kinds of social investments to be made by firms and let firms work with competitive NGOs to achieve their social goals**. The U.S. experiment with tax breaks for business development in enterprise zones in inner cities is an example of how government can provide positive incentives for specific kinds of specific kinds of social investments made by the private sector.

### Aff Answers-Ethics

**Engaging in the market is key to ethics—only way to produce social harmony**

**Fourcade and Healy 07**

Marion Fourcade (Department of Sociology, University of California) and Kieran Healy (Department of Sociology, University of Arizona)”Moral Views of Market Society” Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 33 (2007), pp. 285-311 Jstor Accessed: 09/07/2013 EJS

**The reason morality seems a priori irrelevant to economics is that, as Smith discovered, a system may be virtuous and harmonious as a whole no matter how selfish its constituent parts** are. But here is the twist: **Each individual's hunger for profit will be kept in check by a similar drive among other individuals. Rather than producing ruthless greed, self-interest will tend to make people polite, serviceable, and honest.** Thus, Smith (1978, p. 538; cited in Stigler 1981, pp. 172-73) also wrote that "**whenever commerce is introduced into any country, probity and punctuality always accompany it**.... Of all the nations of Europe, the Dutch, the most commercial, are the most faithful to their word." **Markets, then, not only produce economic harmony (the satisfaction of individuals' desires and needs), they also create social harmony.** McCloskey (2006) is today perhaps the most prominent defender of the view that markets encourage not only public but also personal virtue. **Like other virtue ethicists, she seeks to identify both the virtues that comprise good moral character and the individual habits and social institutions that cultivate such virtues in people.** In broad outline, we may contrast this approach with the Kantian and consequentialist traditions, which offer competing theories for judging the morality of actions (whether through the application of deontological principles of moral duty or a utilitarian calculation of the good and bad consequences of one's choices). For McCloskey, **markets nurture a long list of "bourgeois virtues," including integrity, honesty, trustworthiness, enterprise, respect, modesty, and responsibility. Commerce teaches ethics mainly through its communicative dimension, that is, by promoting conversation among equals and exchange between strangers**.

### Aff Answers- Rights

**Individual rights are necessary for freedom across the community—allows challenges to multiple conceptions of the good**

**Pilon 82**

Roger Pilon “Capitalism and Rights: An Essay toward Fine Tuning the Moral Foundations of the FreeSociety” Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Feb., 1982), pp. 29-42 Jstor .Accessed: 09/07/2013 EJS

It is in cases like this, in fact, that we see clearly the difference between rights and values. **To paraphrase Patrick Henry, there is all the difference in the world between defending the right to speak and defending the speech that flows from the exercise of that right**, between defending the right to freedom of religion and defending the religious practices permitted by that right. These are points that today are too little understood or appreciated. **Indeed, we have come in this century to think that law should promote 'the good' which of course is never more than someone's or some group's conception of 'the good'** when in fact the original understanding, as set forth by the Founders, was nothing like that at all. **Laws and governments were instituted to protect our rights, to provide a minimum but basic framework within which each of us might pursue his own conception of the good. Rights leave us free to do that, which means that we are also free to pursue what many, even a majority**, **might think is not very good at all.** This **'abuse' of rights, as it is sometimes characterized, is not to be confused with the violation of rights** (of others); **rather, it is simply the 'bad' that is the other side of the 'good' that comes with respecting rights and indeed it is the mark of every free society**. **Only when we appreciate these subtleties, when we understand that legitimate law is not an instrument for imposing our conception of the good on others, will we be able to defend the free society in all of its richness**.

**Aff Answers- Standard of Living**

**Capitalism has changed the standard of living around the world—only the price system allows us to meet the needs of decentralized populations.**

**Wolfram 11**

Gary Wolfram, William Simon Professor of Economics and Public Policy at Hillsdale College and Business & Media Institute adviser.“Occupy Wall Street Crowd Blind to Benefits of Capitalism”Published: 11/11/2011

The point is that the Roman institutions brought a good deal to the area that was being overlooked by the protesters. The Wall Street **protesters, in their hatred of capitalism, overlook things including the fact that over the last 100 years capitalism has reduced poverty more and increased life expectancy more than in the 100,000 years prior**. Every semester I ask my students: "What would you rather be? King of England in 1263 or you?" **Every student would rather be themself. They enjoy using their iPhone, indoor plumbing, central heating, refrigerators and electric lighting**. All of these things are available to the average person in America today and none of them were available to the aristocracy when the West operated under the feudal system. **How is it that for thousands of years mankind made very little progress in increasing the standard of living and yet today half of the goods and services you use in the next week did not exist when I was born**? It wasn't that there was some change in the DNA such that we got smarter. The Greeks knew how to make a steam engine 3,000 years ago and never made one. **The difference is in how we organize our economic system.** The advent of market capitalism in the mid 18th century made all of the difference. We need not just rely on historical data. Look at cross-section evidence. I try another experiment with my students. I tell them they are about to be born and they can choose whatever country in the world they would like to be born in. The only caveat is they will be the poorest person in that country. Every student picks a country that is primarily organized in a market capitalist system. No one picks a centrally planned state. No one says, "I want to be the poorest person in North Korea, Cuba, or Zimbabwe," countries which are at the bottom of the Heritage Foundation's Index of Economic Freedom. **What does it mean to be poor in our capitalist society** that the Occupy Wall Street crowd so hates? **Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation has several studies of those classified as poor by the U.S. Census Bureau. He found that 80 percent of poor persons in the United States in 2010 had air conditioning, nearly three quarters of them had a car or truck, nearly two-thirds had satellite or cable television, half had a personal computer and more than two-thirds had at least two rooms per person**. **Contrast this with what it means to be poor in Mumbai, India, a country that is moving rapidly towards market capitalism but was burdened for decades with a socialist system**. A recent story in The Economist described Dharavi, a slum in Mumbai, where for many families half of the family members must sleep on their sides in order for the entire family to squeeze into its living space. The Occupy Wall Street movement has shown a lack of understanding of how the market capitalist system works. They appear to think that the cell phones they use, food they eat, hotels they stay in, cars they drive, gasoline that powers the cars they drive and all the myriad goods and services they consume every day would be there under a different system, perhaps in more abundance. But there is no evidence this could be or ever has been the case. The reason is that only market capitalism solves the two major problems that face any economy-how to provide an incentive to innovate and how to solve the problem of decentralized information. The reason there is so much innovation in a market system compared to socialism or other forms of central planning is that profit provides the incentive for innovators to take the risk needed to come up with new products. My mother never once complained that we did not have access to the latest Soviet washing machine. We never desired a new Soviet car. **The socialist system relies on what Adam Smith referred to as the benevolent butcher and while there will undoubtedly be benevolent butchers out there, clearly a system that provides monetary rewards for innovators is much more dynamic and successful.** The profit that the Occupy Wall Street protesters decry is the reason the world has access to clean water and anti-viral drugs. The other major problem that must be solved by any economic system is how to deal with the fact that information is so decentralized. **There is no way for a central planner to know how many hot dogs 300 million Americans are going to want at every moment in time. A central planner cannot know the relative value of resources in the production of various goods and services. Market capitalism solves that problem through the price system. If there are too few hot dogs, the price of hot dogs will rise and more hot dogs will be produced. If too many hot dogs are produced, the price of hot dogs will fall and fewer will be produced. Market capitalism is the key to the wealth of the masses**. As Ludwig von Mises wrote in his 1920 book, Socialism, only market capitalism can make the poor wealthy. Nobel Laureate Friedrich Hayek in his famous 1945 paper, The Use of Knowledge in Society, showed that only the price system in capitalism can create the spontaneous order that ensures that goods will be allocated in a way that ensures consumers determine the use of resources. The Occupy Wall Street movement would make best use of its time and energy in protesting the encroachment of the centrally planned state that led to the disaster of the Soviet Union, fascist Germany, and dictatorial North Korea.

### Aff Answers- Economic Collapse Cont…

(Continued –No text deleted)

aggressively, insulate the judiciary from political pressure through whistle-blower protections, and increase standards for those employed in law enforcement.¶ Argentina should not look on these reforms as options. Unless the country resumes strong economic growth soon, it will likely default on its debt and see its access to international capital markets crippled.¶ Restoring economic stability and promoting growth for Argentina will benefit the United States as well as the Argentine people. To help avert another crisis in Argentina, the Bush Administration should encourage Argentina to end its cyclical dependence on IMF loans and make the reforms necessary to stimulate growth. Economic growth would enable the government to service its debt and--if expenditures are also cut--end its reliance on IMF loans.¶ It is just as imperative, however, that the role played

by international financial institutions in the global economy be restricted. The Bush Administration should seek to implement the recommendations of the congressionally mandated International Financial Institutions Advisory Commission, chaired by Allan H. Meltzer of Carnegie Mellon University, in order to establish a solid framework for reforming the IMF and World Bank. The reforms should maximize the organizations' effectiveness, increase accountability for their lending decisions, and limit their harmful influence in the global market.¶ Future crises will be less likely in an environment that promotes the efficiencies and benefits of open markets. Unless the Administration addresses the "absence of capitalism" that afflicts economies around the world by taking this approach, economic crises will become more frequent and more severe.

### Aff Answers-Environment

#### New tech allows us to use less--Capitalism provides incentives for countries to minimize consumption of resources

Tupy 12, (Marian Tupy, policy analyst with the Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity, JUNE 29, 2012, “The Miracle that Is the iPhone (or How Capitalism Can Be Good for the Environment)”, Cato institute, 7/9/13 SS, <http://www.cato.org/blog/miracle-iphone-or-how-capitalism-can-be-good-environment>)

Dematerialization, in other words, should be **welcome news for those who worry about the ostensible conflict between the growing world population on the one hand and availability of natural resources on the other hand**. While opinions regarding scarcity of resources in the future differ, **dematerialization will better enable our species to go on enjoying material comforts and be good stewards of our planet at the same time**. That is particularly important **with regard to the people in developing countries, who ought to have a chance to experience material plenty in an age of rising environmental concerns.¶ Maybe** I am too much of an optimist, but d**ematerialization could also lead to a greater appreciation of capitalism. Namely, the “profit motive” can be good for the environment**. No, I am not talking about dumping toxic chemicals into our rivers, which is illegal and should be prosecuted. Rather, I am talking about the **natural propensity of firms to minimize inputs and maximize output**s. **Take the humble soda can. According to the Aluminum Association, “In 1972… a pound of aluminum yielded 21.75 cans. Today, as a result of can-makers’ use of less metal per unit, one pound of aluminum can produce 33 cans**.”

### Aff Answers—Poverty

Capitalism solves poverty and creates freedom. inclusive growth means that growth spills over to impoverished areas.

**Miller and Kim 2013**

(Terry and Anthony, Terry Miller is Director of the Center for International Trade and Economics and Anthony B. Kim is a Senior Policy Analyst in the Center for International Trade and Economics , “Promoting Economic Freedom: Key to Realizing the World Bank’s Mission”, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/promoting-economic-freedom-key-to-realizing-the-world-bank-s-mission>, accessed 7/10/13, JK)

Amartya Sen, a Nobel laureate economist who has made considerable contributions to development economics, once noted that “development consists of the removal of various types of unfreedoms that leave people with little choice and little opportunity for exercising their reasoned legacy.”[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/promoting-economic-freedom-key-to-realizing-the-world-bank-s-mission#_edn2) People crave liberation from poverty, and they hunger for the dignity of free will. By reducing barriers to these fundamental human rights, the forces of freedom create a sustainable framework in which people can fulfill their dreams of success.¶ Indeed, the process of advancing economic freedom is at the heart of development and poverty reduction. Dynamic and inclusive growth occurs as the result of progress by individuals. Successful societies are collections of successful individuals, and when ordinary people have the opportunity to make decisions for themselves, their chances for individual success are maximized. Economic freedom—cultivated and maintained by the rule of law, limits on government, regulatory efficiency, and open markets—is critical to generating the broader-based economic dynamism that brings more opportunities for people to work, produce, and save.¶ This multi-dimensional relationship between economic freedom and development has been documented in The Heritage Foundation’s annual Index of Economic Freedom. The data collected for the Index demonstrates empirically that a high level of economic freedom induces a greater level of prosperity and also facilitates progress in overall human development, including better health, longer lives, greater education, and cleaner environments. And most relevant to the mission of the World Bank, economically freer countries have a much better record at reducing poverty.[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/promoting-economic-freedom-key-to-realizing-the-world-bank-s-mission" \l "_edn3)¶ As indicated by the findings of the Index, sustaining dynamic and inclusive economic growth requires putting into practice three fundamental principles of economic freedom: (1) empowerment of the individual, (2) nondiscrimination, and (3) open competition. ¶ These principles do not constitute a dogmatic ideology. In fact, they represent the antithesis of dogmatism, allowing individuals the freedom and flexibility to embrace diverse and even competing strategies for the pursuit of a brighter future. In other words, as succinctly pointed out by President John F. Kennedy decades ago, “the wave of the future is not the conquest of the world by a single dogmatic creed but the liberation of the diverse energies of free nations and free men.”[[4]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/promoting-economic-freedom-key-to-realizing-the-world-bank-s-mission" \l "_edn4)¶

### Aff Answers—Poverty

#### Capitalism solves for poverty – conditions before capitalism were far worse, even the poorest of the poor are better off under a capitalist system, and growth is key to sustain future populations.

**Brook and Watkins 2013**

(Yaron and Don, Brook is president of the Ayn Rand Center for Individual Rights., Don Watkins is an analyst at the Ayn Rand Center for Individual Rights., “Capitalism In No Way Caused Poverty, It Inhereited It”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/objectivist/2013/02/25/capitalism-in-no-way-created-poverty-it-inherited-it/>, February 25th 2013, Forbes, accessed 7/10/13, JK)

Remember the historical context. As Ayn Rand observed, “Capitalism did not create poverty—it inherited it.” For much of human history, the vast majority of the population was mired in poverty. All too often, the average individual lived in unimaginably wretched conditions. It was only in the nineteenth century, and then only in the West, that the masses started to enjoy prosperity.¶ Keep that in mind when you hear about living and working conditions during the nineteenth century. Because it’s true—by today’s standards, the living and working conditions of the time were often miserable. But by the standards of everything that had come before, they were not. For the men and women working those jobs, they were often a godsend.¶ Remember also, the population of the time was growing at a rate never before seen in human history—so fast that early economists like Malthus wrung their hands over whether such growth could be sustainable. How did the West actually sustain those growing numbers? Only through the rising productivity made possible by capitalism. Many of the workers who manned the factories would not have been able to survive at all in the era before capitalism.¶ Indeed, two basic facts speak more loudly than any statistical study could. First, factory owners did not have the power to force workers to labor in their factories; all they could do was offer work at a given wage to people who were free to accept the offer, or reject it and look for work elsewhere. Second, people flocked to those jobs, emigrating to the cities from America’s farms and from abroad.¶ How, then, did conditions for workers improve? Just as businessmen had to compete for customers, offering better products and lower prices, so they had to compete for workers, offering them better wages and better working conditions. This process of competition led businessmen to bid wages up to reflect workers’ productivity: the more productive workers became—the more skills they developed, the more efficiently they were managed, the more capital and technology they could employ—the higher their wages tended to rise.¶ As a result of the era’s mounting productivity, the statistics show steadily rising wages and steadily declining working hours—long before the government intervened to “protect” workers. Real wages more than tripled over the course of the nineteenth century.¶ In 1870, according to research from Michael Cox and Richard Alm, the average worker worked 3,069 hours a year. But as his productivity increased, by 1913 he could enjoy a much-improved standard of living working only 2,632 hours. Or consider how much easier it got to earn the money for a half-gallon of milk (56 minutes in 1900, down to 31 minutes in 1930) or 100 kilowatt hours of electricity (107 hours in 1900, but only 11 hours in 1930).¶ What about child labor? Didn’t nineteenth-century capitalism sentence children to hard and dangerous work? Child labor, despite what we’ve heard, was not created by capitalism. It’s a practice that stretches back to prehistory, when children would spend hours toiling in the scorching sun or freezing rain, risking disease, injury, or death, virtually as soon as they could walk.¶ Why were most children made to work before the twentieth century? Is it because parents were sadistic and governments cruel? Hardly. It’s because, before capitalism made us rich, children had to work if they were to survive at all. When a family lives on the equivalent of a dollar a day, there is no alternative: if you can work, you work.¶ What eliminates child labor is not government decree but a rising standard of living. That’s what eliminated it in the West during the nineteenth century, and that is what is eliminating it today in countries like China. As parents grow richer, one of the first things they do is use their burgeoning incomes to send their children to school.¶ If capitalism is what caused the West to grow rich, then it was capitalism, not government intervention, that eliminated child labor in the developed world.¶ This is not to deny that governments have limited or forbidden child labor by law. But child labor was going away on its own, and the laws were far from benign. By pushing children out of the newer, more visible factories where these laws were easier to enforce, hungry children were forced to seek work at smaller, older, more dangerous factories—or failing that, as economist Ludwig von Mises notes, to “infest the country as vagabonds, beggars, tramps, robbers, and prostitutes.”¶ To be sure, life during the early days of capitalism was hard (as life had always been), but for anyone willing and able to work, life was better than it had ever been—and getting better.¶ The lesson for us today? Laissez-faire doesn’t impoverish us, but makes us progressively richer.¶

### Aff Answers- Violence

**Moves towards socialism ignore its history of violence**

**Thatcher 13**

Liz Thatcher”This May Day: Media Fail to Acknowledge Any Downside of Socialism More than 100 million deaths because of socialism, networks ignore them” 5/1/2013 9:15 AM Accessed 7-10-13 EJS

“Socialist” is a word often used in conjunction with President Obama, but seldom explained by the major media. During the White House Correspondents Dinner, the president even joked that “I'm not the strapping young Muslim Socialist that I used to be.” It might be a joke to the president, but **to millions who have lived under socialism, it has been a nightmare. That hasn’t been the way the media have treated it.** In the past two years, there have been 74 news stories where “socialist” or “socialism” was mentioned on all three broadcast networks morning and evening shows. Of those 74 stories, not once was socialism even defined. It was used neutrally, to describe Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez, the newly elected president of France, or as the ideology that Margaret Thatcher fought … but the reports failed to define what exactly this ideology is, or why people like Thatcher might be fighting it. **The networks even distorted the term**. On the March 5, 2013, edition of ABC’s “World News,” anchor **Diane Sawyer hyped socialism with a positive spin regarding Chavez’s policies**. “Chavez grew up poor and after winning his first of four presidential elections, he publicly called for the redistribution of the country’s oil wealth to Venezuela’s poor.” On March 8, 2013, NBC’s “Today” **news anchor Natalie Morales glamorized Hugo Chavez’s funeral as a “hero’s send-off”** and described him as “a harsh critic of the U.S.” On April 22, 2012, CBS anchor Jeff Glor spoke of France’s first socialist president in 17 years, and even hyped that the “former socialist favorite” voting for the new socialist candidate in the election. While lamenting the death of a socialist dictator like Chavez, **the networks failed to consider the effects that socialism has had. More than 6 million Jews were killed in the Holocaust during World War II** – a tragedy so horrendous it’s called it a “Holocaust.” **Socialism has claimed 94 million more victims**. **Media outlets would not dare to revel in the legacy of Hitler, yet Chavez was a dictator to be remembered. Don’t forget that Chavez was a ruthless dictator, who often aided Cuba and guerilla gangs in neighboring countries to Venezeula**.

### Aff Answers –War

**Entrepreneurial capitalism prevents the conditions for war**

**Shramm 06**

Carl J. Schramm, president and CEO of the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation which focuses on advancing entrepreneurial success. “Capitalism spreads freedom even as democracy falters “6-2-2006 <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2006-06-27-capitalism\_x.htm> Accessed 7-10-

Smith's great revelation was that political freedom would most likely emerge and persist under conditions of economic freedom, what we now call capitalism. Our democratic system as defined in our Constitution incorporated respect for this economic system. **Like Smith's invisible hand in the market, the Framers saw an invisible hand in our politics. They believed that, if allowed to work freely, these hands together would shape America into the land where invention, creativity and entrepreneurial activity would flourish.** **There would be no danger of an aristocracy of wealth because the instruments of financial success were available to every person. I**n the two centuries since then, **Smith's proposition has served to advance all of civilization. America has become the hope of the oppressed, the "mother of exiles" and the cradle of modern commerce**. **Twice, America considered turning away from economic freedom. In the Depression, nationalization was seriously considered**, and Presidents Roosevelt and Truman did attempt to take over several industries. **In the late 1970s, in the face of low growth and high inflation, the nation nearly** followed the advice of such economists as Harvard's Wassily Leontief and John Kenneth Galbraith to **establish[ed] government central planning**. Instead, in the 1980s, we returned to our origins and bet on individual entrepreneurs rather than on government bureaucrats. The result has been today's extraordinary economic engine — Smith's entrepreneurial capitalism at work. Indeed, research from the University of Maryland and Census Bureau shows that net jobs created by businesses less than five years old exceeded 20% per year during the '80s and '90s (equating to millions of jobs), **while jobs created by more mature businesses remained essentially flat. Even so, what do we do now in the face of a new enemy to freedom, driven by a notion that our democratic way should be eliminated? More than the export of democracy, it is the export of entrepreneurial capitalism that can produce a new birth of peace and freedom around our globe.** **Entrepreneurial capitalism is based on individual invention, and because wealth comes from one's own initiative, it advances human dignity.**  And here is the good news. **Virtually every country, whatever its political system, wants to embrace it. They have seen the success of the American economy. It has been said that when goods cross borders, armies don't. Today, China and India are the world's two largest countries racing toward entrepreneurial capitalism. They are the example and test of that thesis. Several decades ago, their armies clashed. Now no one talks of war, only of their economic emergence.** Capitalism has promoted peace and, in China, better — though still inadequate — respect for rights. If, with our assistance, Adam Smith's entrepreneurial capitalism were to become ubiquitous, the cross-border investment in the success of our brothers and sisters around the world, and theirs in us, would cause people everywhere to see the futility of ancient struggles, whether based on plunder, conquest or theocratic fervor. **In the insight of our invisible founder is the secret for achieving a future of global peace**

### Aff Answers –War

#### Capitalism is the driving force for peace, multiple warrants

Bandow 05,

(Doug Bandow, senior fellow at the Cato Institute. He served as a special assistant to President Reagan, November 10, 05, “Spreading Capitalism Is Good for Peace”, Cato Institute, 7/9/13 SS, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/spreading-capitalism-is-good-peace>)

The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches.¶ Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.¶ Positive economic trends are not enough to prevent war, but then, neither is democracy. It long has been obvious that democracies are willing to fight, just usually not each other. Contends Gartzke, “liberal political systems, in and of themselves, have no impact on whether states fight.”¶ In particular, poorer democracies perform like non-democracies. He explains: “Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels.”¶ Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences.¶ Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains.

**Aff Answers- Perm**

The binary between free trade and protectionism ignores alternative economic systems that are better than free trade alone.

Culbertson 2004

(John Culbertson, Ph.D. is emeritus professor of Economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. “U.S. Free Trade with Mexico -- Is It Progress or Self-destruction?”, The Social Contract PressVolume 14, Number 2 Winter 2003-2004, [http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc1402/article\_83.shtml, accessed 7/9/13](http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc1402/article_83.shtml,%20accessed%207/9/13), JK)

Depending on the world-view and vocabulary used to depict it, US free trade with Mexico can seem anything from an obviously progressive step to an action ruinous to the United States and damaging to human prospects. The favorable interpretation now prevailing in both the political right and left in the United States proves, on consideration, to reflect a misleading conceptualization of the subject arising from a fashionable utopian ideology.¶ Seeking the truth on this subject thus requires first its depropagandization. The valid name for what is called free trade is foreign trade not subject to regulation by the nation's government, that is, mandatory deregulation of the nation's foreign trade - like deregulation of its savings associations, banks, airlines. The valid name for what is called barriers to trade is regulation of trade. The misleading labels present an image of regulation of foreign trade as unnatural and inherently destructive, a crime against the ways of the world. In truth, foreign trade has always been regulated by governments.¶ The human world always has been made up of many independent, or free, tribes, kingdoms, empires, or nations. Preserving this structure of human life requires the regulation of foreign trade. Unregulated foreign trade undercuts the independence of nations, prevents their developing along different paths. In the absence of effective supranational government, the deregulation of foreign trade leaves mankind adrift, its diverse and discordant societies merged into impotence, dropped together into a single pot, with no government at any level that is capable of preserving a civilized level of life or preventing the destruction of the earthly habitat. Far from being obviously correct, unregulated foreign trade is revolutionary; fashionably but irresponsibly revolutionary.¶ The free-trade fable exercises its mind-ruling power by exploiting the human weakness for making issues a struggle between Good and Evil. It provides a stereotype of regulation of foreign trade as protectionism, depicted as import restrictions that damage the nation and the world but are imposed through the power of evil 'special interests'. The evil protectionists are portrayed as acting out of anti-social selfishness or of racism, an urge to bash some nation, or a show of indifference to foreign poverty. In the Good-versus-Evil conceptualization of foreign trade, protectionism/the Evil, commonly is depicted as the only option other than free trade/the Good. President Reagan's consistent characterization of his trade policy for the United States as one of fighting protectionism illustrates the pattern.¶ Is it true that the only options on foreign-trade policy are free trade or protectionism? The trade policy, through which Japan took over valuable US markets, industries, and jobs through one-sided foreign trade, ran huge trade surpluses with the US and become large owners of US properties - is this free trade or is it protectionism? Of course, the answer is neither - neither the answer for Japan nor for most other nations. In reality, there are many kinds of trade policy available. ¶ Posing the choice as free trade or protec-tionism illustrates a basic technique in the manipulative use of language, the misstated either-or, as in Hitler's proffered choice Nazism or Jewish communism; Stalinism's idealized socialism or Satanic capitalism. The stereotype of protectionism functions as a contrived Evil to be paired with free trade as the Good. Given the effectiveness with which such propagandistic use of language has been analyzed by Hayakawa and others, it is surprising that self-respecting Americans across the political spectrum, both Ronald Reagan and the editorial writers of The New York Times, rely on it to support the deregulation of foreign trade - with no consideration of the actual effects of alternative trade policies. Economists commonly use the same concep-tualization, contrasting the negatively stereotyped protectionism with misleading examples in which unregulated foreign trade automatically brings the best of all possible worlds - examples that do not correspond to evidence and experience.¶

### Aff Answers- Standard of Living

**Capitalism has increased value to life over for countries willing to engage markets**

**Leeson 10**

Peter T. Leeson, Becker Center on Chicago Price Theory, Booth School of Business, University of Chicago, “Capitalism has Two Cheers for Capitalism?“ March 30th, 2010. <www.peterleeson.com/Two\_Cheers\_for\_Capitalism.pdf> Accessed 7-10-13 EJS

My finding is straightforward: the two cheers for capitalism view is wrong. **Although many relationships in the social sciences are unclear, capitalism’s relationship to development isn’t one of them. Unless one is ashamed of unprecedented increases in income, rising life expectancy, greater education, and more political freedom, there’s no reason to be a milquetoast defender of capitalism**. **That is what sprawling free markets have meant for countries that became more capitalist over the last quarter century**. **There’s no evidence that countries that eschewed the global trend toward freer markets and embraced substantially greater state control performed better on any of these indicators. On the contrary, they performed demonstrably worse**. I also find that the two cheers for capitalism variant that desires markets, but “within reason,” is wrong. There’s no evidence for a Lorenz curvetype relationship between capitalism and development. **Development is monotonically increasing in capitalism. Maximal capitalism begets maximal development. It doesn’t make one “dogmatic” to acknowledge these facts. It makes one dogmatic to refuse to acknowledge them**. They are facts. **There are precious few overwhelmingly clear relationships in the social sciences. We should embrace this one rather than running away from it. The data clearly support capitalism’s superiority for development and merit its unqualified defense by social scientists who believe that wealth is better than poverty, life is better than death, and liberty is better than oppression**. Full-force cheerleading for capitalism is well deserved and three cheers are in order instead of two.

### Aff Answers- Perm

#### Considering alternative systems beyond just the Protectionism/Free Trade dichotomy is key to create sustainable policies.

Culbertson 2004

(John Culbertson, Ph.D. is emeritus professor of Economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. “U.S. Free Trade with Mexico -- Is It Progress or Self-destruction?”, The Social Contract PressVolume 14, Number 2 Winter 2003-2004, [http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc1402/article\_83.shtml, accessed 7/9/13](http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc1402/article_83.shtml,%20accessed%207/9/13), JK)

Thus, to consider alternative trade policies in terms of their effects requires escaping from the whole system of deceptive stereotypes that dominates US discussion of the subject. A realistic consider-ation of the effects of alternative systems of foreign trade can well begin with the observation of the great liberal economist, J. M. Keynes (National Self-Sufficiency, Yale Review, 1933) that the system of foreign trade must be chosen to fit the political, economic, social, and international-relations realities of the times. Keynes, deploring his own zealous earlier support of the free-trade doctrine, pointed out that it made no sense to attempt to bring about laissez-faire foreign trade in the political and economic world of the 20th century - whether or not it would have been reasonable in an earlier era. ¶ Keynes recognized the all-important point that unregulated foreign trade implied economic entanglement among nations. Unregulated foreign trade subordinates the goals, standards, powers of the nation to the interests of private parties in all nations. Deregulating its foreign trade costs a nation its freedom of action, its effective independence, its ability to chart its own course and to learn its own lessons from its successes and its failures.¶ The nineteenth-century vision of world-wide deregulation of foreign trade in the context of universal economic laissez-faire thus had no applicability to the political and economic world that arose from the First World War, in which nations explicitly adopted different theories, ideologies, and policy goals. The political and economic situation of the 20th century required policies that could bring about constructive, mutually beneficial patterns of foreign trade among independent nations operating under different political and economic agendas and goals. We do not wish, therefore, to be at the mercy of world forces working out...some uniform equilibrium according to the ideal principles, if they can be called such, of laissez-faire capitalism. We wish...to be our own masters and to be as free as we can make ourselves from the interferences of the outside world, wrote Keynes.¶ I sympathize, therefore, with those who would minimize, rather than with those who would maximize, economic entanglement among nations. Ideas, knowledge, science, hospitality, travel - these are the things which should of their nature be international. But let goods be homespun whenever it is reasonably and conveniently possible, and, above all, let finance be primarily national. For these strong reasons, therefore, I am inclined to the belief that...a greater measure of national self-sufficiency and economic isolation among countries than existed in 1914 may serve the cause of peace rather than otherwise.¶ Keynes noted that any loss of production efficiency from maintaining a nation's economic independence was in many cases small or trivial - and that the existence and amount of any such inefficiency depends on circumstances and cannot be inferred from ideologically-biased principles Experience accumulates to prove that most modern processes of mass production can be performed in most countries and climates with almost equal efficiency. ¶ In Keynes' valid conception of efficiency, for example, shifting the production of telephones for the US market from a factory in Louisiana to an identical factory in Thailand does not increase efficiency; it reduces efficiency but is profitable because it replaces high-income labor with low-income labor. Shifting world manufacturing production from high-wage to low-wage nations does not increase efficiency and world output. An increase in the volume of world trade of this type is not progress; it may be ruinous.¶ Foreign trade of genuine efficiency would provide the means of permanently benefitting both nations rather than temporarily benefitting one nation at the expense of the other. In real-world conditions, such efficiency-based and mutually beneficial patterns of foreign trade are ordinarily attainable only on the basis of a set of constructive trade policies. That the basic distinction between efficiency-based, beneficial trade and level-the-nations-downward trade has been lost in recent discussion, even by most economists, perhaps must be explained by the dominance of propaganda in the discussion of foreign trade, which has hidden even the most basic causal relations.¶ Keynes thus favored a system of regulated foreign trade that would work

(Continued –No text deleted)

### Aff Answers- Perm Cont…

(Continued –No text deleted)

constructively in a world of free and independent - non-globalized - nations. That is, he favored a system of construc-tively regulated foreign trade, which is not so-called free trade and is not so-called protectionism. But historical accidents put the path of opinion and events since the 1930s under the domination of a massive US

attempt to implement a peculiar version of world-wide free trade.¶ The intellectual and political father of this movement was Cordell Hull, the US Secretary of State from 1933 to 1944. The rationale of Hull's pursuit of deregulation of foreign trade differed from the now-dominant one. Having conceived as early as 1916 that unhampered trade dove-tailed with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers, and unfair economic competition with war, Hull and his US State Department developed the concepts and the program that still underlie the US campaign for the deregulation of foreign trade to attack not an alleged economic inefficiency of protectionism but asserted war-causing effects of international economic rivalries and trade wars.¶ Hull was able to gain acquiescence in his version of foreign-trade deregulation during the temporary US dominance of the world at the end of the Second World War. Keynes never supported Hull's approach, referring to the lunatic proposals of Mr. Hull. Had Keynes' view governed the postwar arrangements for foreign trade, international economic and political developments would have taken a quite different course. It was not the inexorable march of progress but a curious set of circumstances that brought the world-trade situation to its present crisis.¶ Patterns of trade that benefit both of the nations involved do not arise naturally from the profit-seeking dealings of private parties of all nations. Mutually beneficial foreign trade requires a constructive framework of national trade policy that (1) prevents out-of-balance or one-way trade that shifts industries, jobs, and economic ownership from a trade-deficit to a trade-surplus nation, (2) prevents the shifting of the industries with bright futures to one nation thus leaving to the other nation only the declining and low-pay industries, (3) prevents nations from being damaged by instability imposed by the trade, such as the dumping of goods in a foreign market below production cost to weaken its industry and take over its market, (4) prevents the pattern of trade from unduly undermining the independence and defense capabilities of the nation, and (5) avoids the one-sidedness of trade benefit that arises when the trade on one side is arranged on behalf of the nation by its government and on the other side is handled by firms that are competing against one another in pursuit of private profit.

**Aff Answers- Economic Collapse**

#### Capitalism is the only check against economic instability– Argentina proves.

**Eiras and Schaefer 2001**

(Ana I and Brett D, Ana I. Eiras is an Economic Policy Analyst for Latin America and Brett D. Schaefer is Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs, “Argentina's Economic Crisis: An "Absence of Capitalism", April 19th 2001, The Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2001/04/argentinas-economic-crisis-an-absence-of-capitalism>, accessed 7/9/13, JK)

As U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Paul O'Neill explained to The Financial Times in February, the key factor underlying recent financial crises is not a failure of capitalism, but an "absence of capitalism." Argentina provides a cogent example; its lack of economic freedom--the necessary environment for capitalism to work effectively--resulted in continual economic decline and, ultimately, the financial crisis that erupted in November 2000.¶ Poor economic policies and political instability contributed to Argentina's decline from its noteworthy position as the world's 10th wealthiest nation in 1913 to the world's 36th wealthiest in 1998. Argentina is the only wealthy country to experience so great a reversal in recent history, despite the involvement of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Indeed, the IMF's loans and guidance have aggravated, not alleviated, Argentina's problems. After more than nine bailouts and extensions of IMF loans since 1983, Argentina once again faces a financial crisis, with fewer prospects for stimulating effective economic growth in the future.¶ Instead of supporting a continuation of Argentina's policies that feed the current 33-month-long recession, the Bush Administration should encourage Argentina to adopt policies that will increase economic freedom and lead to long-term growth and stability. Specific policies that the Administration should encourage Argentina to implement include:¶ Adopting the U.S. dollar as its official currency. Speculation about the sustainability of Argentina's currency board helped increase interest rate premiums on debt. The best way for Argentina to address the interest rate premium resulting from currency risk would be to adopt the U.S. dollar as its own currency. This would eliminate the risk stemming from the peso-dollar exchange rate and lead to lower interest rates on the country's debt, which is what happened in El Salvador and Panama after they adopted the dollar.¶ Reduce spending and taxes. To spur economic growth, Argentina needs to bolster productive behavior by lowering taxes to increase the incentive to work, save, and invest. To lower taxes without aggravating the fiscal deficit, it also needs to slash government expenditures. A plan introduced by the Minister of Economy includes a cut in expenditures; but instead of lowering taxes, it would shift the tax burden from businesses to international investors, imposing new costs without allowing the beneficial stimulus associated with an overall reduction in taxes. Restoring economic growth will require much deeper reductions in government expenditures and more extensive tax cuts.¶ Foster further deregulation. President Fernando de la Rúa succeeded in getting a labor reform bill passed by Argentina's Senate and lower house. Argentina should build on this progress by scaling back regulations governing, for example, the ability of employers to lay off employees. The government also needs to scale back the wages and numbers of public-sector employees. This is particularly true in the provinces, where many public-sector workers do not contribute to production and are a drain on public resources.¶ Encourage free trade. Argentina should expand its export markets and diversify its export base by signing agreements with other nations that are receptive to unrestricted trade. Considering the linking of the peso and the dollar, a free trade agreement between the United States and Argentina would be particularly beneficial by providing greater stability to Argentine exporters. Argentina will need to open its market in order to facilitate trade talks with the United States. If necessary, it should withdraw from the Mercosur trading bloc; if it wishes to remain a political ally of Mercosur as Chile has done, it could do so.¶ Strengthen the rule of law. The vulnerability of the judiciary to bribery and political influence has undermined public confidence to the extent that ordinary Argentines do not use the legal system and businesses restrain investments. The Argentine government must punish corruption more
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### Aff Answers—Greed Good

Capitalism is not an immoral system, it uses human selfishness as motivation for win-win situations

Richards 09, (Jay Richards, Senior Fellow at the Discovery Institute and formerly the Program Director of the Discovery Institute's Center for Science and Culture, 2009, “Money, Greed, and God: Why Capitalism is the Solution and Not the problem”, 7/9/13 SS)

Free trade makes it possible for people to play win-win games ¶ of exchange. We’re so used to this that we take it for granted. But imagine the alternative. Let’s go back to the stinky pink ¶ house. Say the pink house costs ﬁve hundred thousand dollars, ¶ because that’s how much it cost to build it. And let’s say the ¶ labor theory of value is the law of the land. Then, for the developer to receive a “just price” for the house, he must receive ﬁve ¶ hundred thousand dollars. But what if no one wants to pay that ¶ much for the house? Then the only way for him to get his “just ¶ price” is for someone to be forced to pay that price, whether the ¶ person likes it or not. That’s not a win-win. That’s a win for the ¶ developer, and a big fat loss for the new, reluctant homeowner. ¶ And eventually it would be a loss for the entire economy. Here’s ¶ why: In a society that worked this way, developers could build ¶ whatever they want, spend as much as they want, ignore what ¶ other people want, hire lazy and lying workers, and still get fully ¶ compensated. A forced market based on the labor theory of value ¶ would lead directly to a world of crummy housing. If this sounds ¶ like an academic fantasy, go check out the housing developments ¶ built under the Soviet Union. They make the stinky pink house ¶ look good. Let’s dispense with a forced housing market based on a bogus ¶ theory of value and free things up a bit. If the developer can’t ¶ make you buy his house, he’s going to be more careful to build ¶ houses that people will freely buy. He’s going to look for ways ¶ to set up a win-win situation. He’s going to think about what other people want rather than what he wants to build. He’s ¶ going to look for ways to build houses below the price people are ¶ freely willing to pay. Even if he’s selﬁsh, he’s going to be directed ¶ toward meeting the needs of others. If he does this well, he may ¶ get fabulously rich, but none of his customers should begrudge ¶ him his wealth, because they all got something that they wanted ¶ more than the money they gave him. Win-win.¶ Ditto when it comes to employment. If you aren’t forced to ¶ take a job building a Web site for an ad agency, you’ll take the ¶ job only if you think you’ll be better off as a result. And the ¶ agency won’t hire you unless they believe they’ll be better off. So ¶ it’s a win on both sides. You shouldn’t compare who’s better off ¶ as a result of the deal, you or the ad agency. That way lies envy. ¶ Since it’s a free exchange, you should compare your status with ¶ the job versus your status without it.¶ Of course, this doesn’t mean that in a free market no one ever ¶ loses. After all, what about the other guys competing for the same ¶ business? Go back to the example of developers. There are only so ¶ many customers looking for houses. And if our developer sells his ¶ houses to ten people, there are ten fewer customers for everyone ¶ else trying to sell houses. Surely it’s a big fat loss for them, isn’t it? ¶ Obviously they will lose those sales. A free market doesn’t guarantee that everyone wins in every competition. Rather, it allows ¶ many more win-win encounters than any alternative.¶ That said, remember that the other developers are also potential customers. Even they may beneﬁt directly if they buy the ¶ better, cheaper houses sold by their competitor. Or they may ¶ beneﬁt indirectly as homebuyers because the market is competitive, so houses will cost less than they would otherwise. So ¶ in a market, competition is almost always better than monopoly, ¶ since competitors generally will focus on meeting the wants and ¶ needs of consumers rather than on stealing from them.